





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

ROMAN CATHOLICISM
SCRIPTURALLY CONSIDERED;

OR,

The Church of Rome

THE

GREAT APOSTASY.

BY

CHARLES P. JONES,
OF THE NORTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE.

"Search the Scriptures."—JESUS.

"To the law and to the testimony."—ISAIAH.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY M. W. DODD,
No. 59 CHAMBERS STREET,
REAR OF THE PARK.
1856.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by
M. W. D O D D,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court, for the Southern District of New York.

E. O. JENKINS,
Printer and Stercotyper,
No. 26 FRANKFORT STREET.

PREFACE.

THE doctrines in controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics involve the truth of God and the salvation of souls. They also involve the progress and well-being of society, as they affect civil and religious liberty. They merit, therefore, at our hands, an earnest, searching, thorough investigation. If the Church of Rome hold, as she affirms, the only true doctrine, and if out of her pale there is no salvation, it behooves every one to know it. If, however, she is in error, has "fallen away," is the Great Apostasy, so clearly revealed and graphically described in prophecy, it is equally important that all should know it.

It must be clear to every mind, and is, perhaps, admitted by all, that there must be some rule, some infallible standard, to which all questions in dispute may be appealed for final adjudication. *The Bible is that standard. Tradition is uncertain, fallible; contradicts God's Word and itself.* To the Bible, therefore, we come with all the questions at issue, and in its clear, heavenly, infallible light examine them, and in its holy, unerring balance weigh them. Let the world judge

(iii)

the entire competency of the tribunal, and of the emphatic, unequivocal response returned.

Long and obstinate has been the controversy; and everything, it would seem, has been said that could be said; and most ably and fully have Protestants shown and vindicated the truth of God. But every age, every generation, has some peculiarities, which, with new evolutions and assaults of the foe, make it necessary to buckle on again the armor of God, and fight for the faith once delivered to the saints. This is especially so at the present time: Rome is marshaling her hosts and sending out her legions to overrun and subjugate this fair heritage of ours. She is bold, defiant, and sanguine of success. She must be met with a spirit of unshrinking fidelity to God and his truth; her true character as Antichrist portrayed, and her intolerant, persecuting, tyrannical spirit exhibited to the patriots and Christians of this land. This the Author has essayed to do in the following pages. How far he has succeeded an intelligent community must judge. He trusts, however, that, to some extent, at least, he has filled the desideratum which just now is felt—has met, partially though it be, the present demands of the Church and the Age.

Information has been drawn from every source within reach of the Author. Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians and writers have been carefully examined; and no doctrine has been stated, no position taken touching the practice and claims of Rome, but that the former define and promulgate as dogmas and usages of their Church. Milner's *End of Controversy*, Challoner's *Catholic Christian*, Dens' *Theology*, The

Roman Catechism, The Prayer Book, The Christian's Guide to Heaven, History of the Council of Trent, by Pallavicini, Gahan's History of the Church, Brownson's Review, &c., &c.,—standard works—clear exponents and emphatic defenders of the doctrines and practice of Rome, have been relied on as authentic, and freely used. Extensive quotations are given from them in the body of the work.

The Author is greatly indebted to Edgar's Variations of Popery, Bungener's History of the Council of Trent, Old Christianity against Papal Novelties, by Ousley, Master-Key to Popery, Sime's History of the Inquisition, D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation, &c. Edgar's Variations and Bungener's History, are invaluable works, and should be in the library of every Protestant.

The critical reader may discover a want of uniformity in the style. The work was written in the midst of heavy pastoral labors. Over nine hundred white members, and one thousand colored, had to be cared for and served. One hundred and fifty miles were usually travelled, monthly, and twenty-five sermons delivered. Thousands of pages were read in the buggy, while travelling from appointment to appointment—thoughts were suggested—arguments elaborated; and then, at "the home," in the bosom of the family, or in the "preacher's room," the pen would be hastily caught up, and the thought or argument written out. Much of it appears as first written. Moreover, intense study of an author, say Milner or Bungener, may have given a tinge to the style. The work, however, was not written for critics, but for the masses; the bone

and sinew, the nerve and soul of this great country. To enlighten them on a subject infinitely momentous, was the object had in view—the motive that moved to write at all, and to write as the Author has written. If this end be gained, he is content, happy.

And now with unaffected diffidence, but with a sincere prayer to God that it may be an instrumentality in accomplishing good, this humble effort in the cause of truth is sent forth to the world.

THE AUTHOR.

LUMBERTON, N. C., *July 29, 1856.*

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PROPHETIC ANNOUNCEMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE GREAT APOSTASY.

Falling away—Man of Sin—Miracles and Lying Wonders—Departure from the Faith—Forbidding to Marry—Beast with Seven Heads and Ten Horns—Beast with Two Horns—Corrupt Woman—Babylon the Great. - - - 11-41

CHAPTER II.

SOURCE AND RULE OF FAITH.

Necessity of a Ruler—The Bible—Tradition—The Fathers and the Bible against Rome—Apocrypha no part of the Canonical Books—Scripture given for every Man—Should be Translated into every Tongue. - - - 42-71

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Infallibility.

Fundamental Doctrine—Where does it Reside?—Six Theories—Not in the Pope—Not in Councils-General—Not in a Council and Pope at its Head—Not in the whole Church—A Fallacy—Unscriptural. - - - 72

Auricular Confession.

All must Confess—Secretly—All Sins—Unscriptural—A Means of Corruption. 116

Priestly Absolution.

Penance a Sacrament—Consists in the Absolving Words of the Priest—The Priest a Visible Saviour—No power to Absolve given to the Apostles—The Tenor of Scriptures—Teaching of Jesus—Practice and Teaching of the Apostles—Fathers against it—Admission of Theologians and Popes. - - - - - 121

Indulgences.

Held by the Church—Decreed by Councils—In conflict with Scripture, with the Fathers, and with Absolution. - - - - - 142

Transubstantiation.

Defined by the Council of Trent—Real Presence—Unscriptural—Unphilosophical—Contradicts the Senses—Absurd—Dr. Tillotson—The Fathers—History of it—Decreed in 1215—Leads to Materialism, Infidelity, Idolatry—Exalts the Priest above God—Blasphemous—Subverts the Gospel—Fulfills Prophecy. - - - 155

Extreme Uncion.

A Sacrament—Without Scripture Foundation—St. James—Not Known and Practiced in the Primitive Church—Against Absolution, and Indulgences, and Transubstantiation—A Farce, or they are a Cheat. - - - - - 184

Purgatory.

To be Held by the Church—Without Anathema—Milner's view—Abraham's Bosom Purgatory—Purgation by Suffering—Scriptural Authority Examined—No Middle State—Purgatory a Novelty—The Fathers—Gives the Priest power over Souls in Eternity—Against Absolution, Indulgences, Transubstantiation, Extreme Uncion—Merits of Suffering—Another Gospel. - - - - - 194

CHAPTER IV.

PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME

She is Idolatrous.

Practice a Test of Doctrine—Tree Known by its Fruits—Worship of the Host—Veneration of Images and Relics—Second command Suppressed—False Translation—Worship of Saints, Angels, and the Virgin. - - - - - 225

She is Intolerant.

Inalienable Rights—Self-Defence—Anathemas—Oath of Bishops, Priests, Popes, Jesuits—Bull against Bible Societies—Language of Bishops and Popes—Brownson. - - - - - 244

She is Persecuting and Blood-Thirsty.

Decrees of Councils, Popes, Emperors—Theologians—Effect of Decree—Walden-
sian Butchery—St. Bartholomew's—Irish Persecution—Inquisition—History—
Work of Blood. - - - - - 262

She is Corrupt.

Abrogation of Oaths—No Faith with Heretics—Celibacy and the Confessional. 308

CHAPTER V.

SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

Spiritual Supremacy.

Four Theories—Without Scripture Foundation—The Rock—The Keys—Peter no
Pope—Never at Rome—If Pope, his Prerogatives could not be Transferred—
Were not transferred—The Chain Broken—An Assumption—Prophecy Ful-
filled. - - - - - 321

Temporal Supremacy.

Predicated of Spiritual—Popes—Brownson—Gallican and Jesuit Views—Claim and
Possession different—Pitt's Queries—Doctrine of the Church—Brownson—Last
Link of Evidence—Summing up. - - - - - 347

CHAPTER VI.

END OF THE GREAT APOSTASY; OR, DESTRUCTION OF
THE MAN OF SIN.

End Revealed — Instrumentalities — Bible—Preaching—Civil Government—Mil-
lennium Dawn. - - - - - 381

THE GREAT APOSTASY.

CHAPTER I.

PROPHETIC ANNOUNCEMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF THE GREAT APOSTASY.

“Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.

“Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.”—2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

HERE is a most solemn announcement and graphic description of a great Apostasy which was to rise up in, spread through, and afflict and curse the Church. The terms used leave no doubt that the defection would be in and of the Church. The revelation and uprising of the Man of Sin, evolved of the apostasy, or the apostasy itself, would not only be in the Church and in the name of the Church, but in the name of the true religion, and of God. He, the Son of Perdition, would wear the habiliments, claim the name, and glory in the prerogatives of the spouse of Christ, and sit in the temple of God, as God and above God.

The church at Thessalonica had been taught, it seems, erroneous views in reference to the second coming of Christ. The faith and hope of some may have wavered. To teach them the true doctrine, and reassure

their faith, and especially to unveil the future and put upon imperishable record the sad truth that a fearful falling away would sweep over and blight the fair heritage of God, the Apostle addressed them and the general Church this warning; delivered this prophecy.

Has this remarkable prediction been fulfilled? Has there come a falling away? Has the Man of Sin been revealed? and does he sit in the temple of God showing himself that he is God? These are not only pertinent and interesting questions, but questions vitally connected with, and deeply affecting the weal of the Church, and the highest interest of man in time and in eternity. To answer these and kindred inquiries according to truth and history, is my earnest desire and honest purpose, in examining this subject. God help us find the truth, and answer as He would answer!

That this prophecy has been, and is now being fulfilled; that the falling away has taken place and now curses the Church and the world; that the Man of Sin has been revealed, and now "sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," I fully believe. The Roman Catholic Church, I as fully believe, is clearly pointed out in this brief sentence, and her character drawn in lines of living light. Or, the Church of Rome meets and fulfils this prophecy to the very letter. She, as I shall show, has fallen away from the teaching of Jesus Christ—the pure faith and simple practice of the Gospel. She is revealed—stands forth to-day as the "Man of Sin," for she is corrupt. She "opposeth and exalteth herself above God,"—she rejects the Bible as a sufficient rule of faith, and persecutes and puts to death the children of God. She

creates God out of a wafer, and assumes universal, spiritual and temporal supremacy over this world "as God." She "sitteth in the temple of God,"—is an ecclesiastical organization, and proclaims that she is the only true Church.

"This apostasy," says, Dr. Clarke, "all concurrent marks and characters will justify us in charging upon the Church of Rome. The true Christian worship is the worship of *the one only God, through the one only mediator, the man Christ Jesus*; and from this worship the Church of Rome has most notoriously departed, by substituting other mediators, and invoking and adoring saints and angels: nothing is apostasy if idolatry be not. And are not the members of the Church of Rome guilty of idolatry in the worship of images, in the adoration of the host, in the invocation of angels and saints, and in the oblation of prayers and praises to the Virgin Mary, as much or more than to God blessed forever? This is the grand corruption of the Christian Church; this is the *apostasy*, as it is emphatically called, and deserves to be called; which was not only predicted by St. Paul, but by the prophet Daniel likewise."

This view is confirmed by the description of the apostle in the 8th, 9th and 10th verses:

"And then shall that wicked be revealed, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

The Church of Rome has ever claimed the power to work miracles. In the Life of St. Patrick, eagerly read by "the faithful," a very great number of miracles are recorded, which are affirmed to have been wrought by him. The Life of St. Xavier, also, is filled up with accounts of miracles, wrought by a word or touch of his, as great and more numerous than those of our Saviour. Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," endorses them all.

The "English Saints" is disgustingly full of them. Relics of saints, paintings and images, priests and people proclaim to the world possess miracle-working power. Who has not heard of weeping, winking Madonnas, and the holy coat of Treves?

"Affixed to the wall over the vessels of holy water"—"water made holy by being exorcised by the priests, mixed with salt, and then prayed over"—"in the church of St. Carlo, in Rome," the following advertisement is seen, and may be read of all:

"The church proposes holy water as a remedy and assistant in many circumstances, both spiritual and corporeal, but especially in these following. Its spiritual uses are :

- "1. It drives away devils from places and persons.
- "2. It affords assistance against fears and diabolical illusions.
- "3. It cancels venial sins.
- "4. It imparts strength to resist temptations.
- "5. It drives away wicked thoughts.
- "6. It preserves safely from the passing snares of the devil.
- "7. It obtains the favor and presence of the Holy Ghost.

"Its corporeal uses are :

- "1. It is a remedy against barrenness, both in women and beasts.
- "2. It is a preservative from sickness.
- "3. It heals the infirmities of the mind and body.
- "4. It purifies infected air, and drives away plague and contagion."

"This is the substance, though not a literal or full translation of the document."*

There are wells in Ireland, called by Romanists "holy wells," which are said to have miraculous virtues. Rev. Dr. Murray thus describes what he saw at one of them :

"There was a vast crowd of poor-looking and diseased people around it. Some were praying, some shouting ; many were up in

* Kerwan's Letters to Taney.

the trees which surrounded it. All these trees were laden, in all their branches, with shreds of cloth of every possible variety and color. I inquired what all this meant. I was told: 'This is St. John's well, and these people come here to get cured.' But what do those rags mean, hanging on the trees? I was told that the people who were not immediately cured, tied a piece of their garments on some limb of the trees to keep the good saint of the well in mind of their application. And judging from the number of pieces tied on the trees, I inferred that the number that went away cured were very few."

The following extract, quoted by Dr. Murray from an eye-witness, gives an account of a festival at St. Patrick's Well, which occurs every mid-summer's eve:

"The men and women come bare-footed, and the heads of all were bound round with handkerchiefs. Some were running in circles, some were kneeling in groups, some were singing in wild concert, some were jumping about like maniacs at the end of an old building. When we had somewhat recovered from the first surprise which the (to us) unaccountably fantastic actions of the crowd had given us, we endeavored to trace the progress of some of these deluded votaries through all the mazes of their mystic penance. The first object of them all appeared to be, the ascent of the steepest and most rugged part of the rock, up which both men and women crawled their painful way on their hands and bare knees. The men's clothes were all made so as to accommodate their knees with all the sharpness of the pointed rock; and the poor women, many of them young and beautiful, took incredible pains to prevent their petticoats from affording any defence against its torturing asperities. Covered with dust, and perspiration, and blood, they at last reached the summit of the rock, where, in a rude sort of chair hewn out of the stone, sat an old man, probably one of their priesthood, who seemed to be the representative of St. Patrick, and the high-priest of this religious frenzy. In his hat each of the penitents deposited a half-penny, after which he turned them round a certain number of times, listened to the long catalogue of their offences, and dictated to them the penance they were to undergo or perform. Then they descended

the rock by another path, but in the same manner and posture, equally careful to be cut by the flints, and to suffer as much as possible. The penitents now returned to the use of their feet, and commenced a running sort of Irish jiggyish walk round several cairns or heaps of stones, erected at different spaces: this lasted for some time. Suddenly they would prostrate themselves before the cairn and ejaculate some hasty prayers." "But the most remarkable, and doubtless the most efficient of the ceremonies, was reserved for the last; and surely nothing was ever devised by man which more forcibly evinced how low our nature can descend. Around the largest of the wells, which was in a building very much, to common eyes, like a stable, all those who had performed their penances were assembled—some dressing, some undressing, many *stark naked*. A certain number of them were admitted at a time into this holy well, and there men and women of every age bathed promiscuously without any covering. They undressed before bathing, and performed the whole business of the toilet afterwards in the open air, in the midst of the crowd."

Are not these—and they are but the thousandth part of what might be given—"signs and lying wonders after the working of Satan"? And do they not mark out, reveal to us, the Church of Rome as "that wicked," the son of perdition? What else, who else, so clearly, fully meets and fulfils the prophecy?

This view is further confirmed by the Apostle's language to Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 1—3:

"Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats."

The departure from the faith is evidently the same as the falling away just described; the same great apostasy. Other and distinctive marks are here brought out.

Some of the causes of the defection are mentioned: "Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; and speaking lies in hypocrisy." Its *cauterizing* effects on the apostates, "Having their conscience seared with a hot iron;" and their authority, "*Forbidding* to marry, and *commanding* to abstain from meats," are revealed. Bishop Newton's criticism on, and exposition of this passage, are so clear and satisfactory that I heartily adopt them, and give them to the reader in preference to anything I might say:

"I. The first thing to be considered is, the apostasy here predicted: 'Some shall depart, or rather *apostatize* from the faith.' An *apostasy from the faith* may be either total or partial; either when we renounce the whole, or when we deny some principal and essential article of it. It is not every error, or every heresy, that is apostasy from the faith. It is a revolt in a principal and essential article when we worship God by an image or representation, or when we worship other beings besides God, and pray unto other mediators besides *the one Mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus*. This is the very essence of Christian worship, to worship the one true God, through the one true Christ; and to worship any other God or any other mediator is apostasy and rebellion against God and against Christ. Such is the nature of *apostasy from the faith*; and it is implied that this apostasy shall be general, and affect great numbers. For, though it be said only *some shall apostatize*, yet by *some*, here, *many* are understood. The original word frequently signifies a *multitude*; and there are abundant instances in Scripture where it is used in that sense, as the reader may perceive from John vi. 64–66; Rom. x. 17; 1 Cor. x. 5, 6. This apostasy may be general and extensive, and include *many*, but not *all*.

"II. It is more particularly shown wherein the apostasy should consist, in the following words: *Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils*; or rather: 'Giving heed to *erroneous* spirits and doctrines concerning *demons*.' *Spirits* seem to be much the

same in sense as *doctrines*; the latter word may be considered as explanatory of the former; and error sometimes signifying *idolatry*, *erroneous doctrines* may comprehend *idolatrous* as well as *false doctrines*. But it is still further added, for explanation, that these doctrines should be *doctrines of devils* or *of demons*, where the genitive case is not to be taken actively, as if demons were the authors of these doctrines, but passively, as if demons were the subject of these doctrines. In Jer. x. 8; Acts xiii. 12; Heb. vi. 2, the genitive case is used in this manner; and, by the same construction, *doctrines of demons* are doctrines *about* or *concerning* demons. This is, therefore, a prophecy that the idolatrous theology of demons, professed by the Gentiles, should be revived among Christians. Demons, according to the theology of the Gentiles, were middle powers between the gods and mortal men; and were regarded as mediators and agents between the gods and men. Of these demons there were accounted two kinds: one kind were the souls of men *deified* or *canonized* after death; the other kind were such as had never been the souls of men, nor ever dwelt in mortal bodies. These latter demons may be paralleled with angels, as the former may with canonized saints; and as we Christians believe there are good and evil angels, so did the Gentiles that there were good and evil demons. It appears, then, as if the doctrine of demons, which prevailed so long in the heathen world, was to be revived and established in the Christian Church. And is not the worship of saints and angels now, in all respects, the same that the worship of demons was in former times? *The name only is different: the thing is essentially the same.* The heathens looked upon their demons as mediators and intercessors between God and men; and are not the saints and angels regarded in the same light by many professed Christians? The promoters of this worship were sensible that it was the same, and that the one succeeded the other; and as the worship is the same, so likewise it is performed with the same ceremonies. Nay, the very same temples, the very same images, the very same altars, which once were consecrated to Jupiter and the other demons, are now consecrated to the Virgin Mary and other saints. The very same titles and inscriptions are ascribed to both: the very same prodigies and miracles are related of these as of those.

III. Such an *apostasy* as this—of reviving the *doctrines of demons*, and worshipping the dead—was not likely to take place immediately ; it should prevail and prosper *in the latter days*. The phrase of the *latter times* or *days*, or the *last times* or *days*, signifies any time that was yet to come ; but denotes more particularly the times of Christianity. The times of Christianity may properly be called the *latter times* or *days*, or the *last times* or *days*, because it is the last of all God's revelations to mankind. Heb. i. 22.

“IV. Another remarkable peculiarity of this prophecy is, the solemn and emphatic manner in which it is delivered. *The Spirit speaketh expressly*. By the Spirit is meant the Holy Spirit of God, which inspired the prophets and apostles. *The Spirit speaking expressly* may signify his speaking precisely and certainly, not obscurely and involvedly, as he is wont to speak in the prophets ; or it may be said, *the Spirit speaketh expressly*, when he speaks in express words in some place or other of Divine Writ ; and the Spirit hath spoken the same thing in express words before in the prophecy of Daniel. Daniel has foretold, in express words, the worship of new demons or demi-gods : Dan. xi. 38. The *mauzzim* of Daniel are the same as the demons of St. Paul ; God's protectors, or saints' protectors, defenders and guardians of mankind. This, therefore, is a prophecy, not merely dictated by private suggestion and inspiration, but taken out of the written Word. It is a prophecy, not only of St. Paul's, but of Daniel's, too ; or rather of Daniel, confirmed and approved by St. Paul.

“V. The apostle proceeds, verse 2, to describe by what means and by what persons this apostasy should be propagated and established in the world. *Speaking lies in hypocrisy, &c.* ; or rather, *through the hypocrisy of liars*, having their conscience, &c. ; for the preposition rendered *in*, frequently signifies *through* or *by*. *Liars*, too, or *speaking lies*, cannot possibly be joined with the original word rendered *some*, and that rendered *giving heed*, because they are in the nominative case, and in this in the genitive. Neither can it well be joined in the construction with the word rendered *devils*, or *demons* ; for how can *demons* or *devils* be said *to speak lies in hypocrisy*, and *to have their conscience seared, &c.* ? It is plain, then, that the great apostasy of the latter times was to prevail *through the hypocrisy of liars, &c.* And has not the great idolatry of Christians, and the

worship of the dead particularly, been diffused and advanced in the world by such instruments and agents? by fabulous books, forged under the names of the apostles and saints, by fabulous legends of their lives; by fabulous miracles, ascribed to their relics; by fabulous dreams and revelations, and even by fabulous saints, who never existed but in imagination.

“VI. Verse 3. *Forbidding to marry, &c.* This is a further character of the promoters of this apostasy. The same hypocritical liars who should promote the worship of demons should also prohibit lawful marriage. The monks were the first who brought a *single life* into repute; they were the first, also, who revived and promoted the worship of demons. One of the primary and most essential laws and constitutions of all monks was the profession of a single life; and it is equally clear that the monks had the principal share in promoting the worship of the dead. The monks, then, were the principal promoters of the worship of the dead in former times. And who are the great patrons and advocates of the same worship now? Are not their legitimate successors and descendants the monks, and priests, and bishops of the Church of Rome? And do not they also profess and recommend a single life, as well as the worship of saints and angels? Thus have the worship of demons and prohibition of marriage constantly gone hand in hand together; and as they who maintain one, maintain the other, so it is no less remarkable that they who disclaim the one, disclaim the other.

“VII. The last mark and character of these men is: *Commanding to abstain from meats, &c.* The same lying hypocrites who should promote the worship of demons, should not only prohibit lawful marriage, but likewise impose unnecessary abstinence from meats; and these, too, as indeed it is fit they should, usually go together as constituent parts of the same hypocrisy. It is as much the law of monks to abstain from meats as from marriage. Some never eat any flesh; others, only certain kinds on certain days. Frequent fasts are the rule and boast of their orders. So lived the monks of the ancient church; so live, with less strictness perhaps, but with greater ostentation, the monks and friars of the Church of Rome; and these have been the principal propagators and defenders of the worship of the dead, both in former and in latter times. The worship of the dead is indeed so monstrously

absurd as well as impious, that there was hardly a probability of its ever prevailing in the world but by hypocrisy and lies. But that these particular sorts of hypocrisy—celibacy, under pretence of chastity; and abstinence, under pretence of devotion—should be employed for this purpose, the Spirit of God alone could foresee and foretell. There is no necessary connection between the worship of the dead, *and forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats*; and yet it is certain that the great advocates for this worship have, by their pretended purity and mortification, procured the greater reverence to their persons, and the readier reception to their doctrines. But this idle, popish, monkish abstinence, is as unworthy of a *Christian* as it is unnatural to a *man*; it is preventing the purpose of nature, and *commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanks—giving by believers, and them who know the truth.*”

“*Forbidding to marry.*” There are nearly a million of priests, and monks, and nuns in the Roman Catholic Church, who are forbidden to marry, and who are bound by laws and vows, oaths they might be called, never to marry. And the millions of “the faithful” in her pale are forbidden to marry in the forty days of Lent, without a permit from the confessor or bishop. Who else forbids to marry? What other church, if church this may be called? None? Then the Church of Rome, and the Church of Rome only, fulfil this prophecy, and is the apostasy. “*And commanding to abstain from meats.*” Rome commands to abstain from meats every Friday, and the forty days of Lent—*ninety-two days in each year!*

In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, the Great Apostasy is announced and described by *two symbolical beasts*:

“1. And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up

out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy.

“2. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.

“3. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast.

“4. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast; and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast: who is able to make war with him?

“5. And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.

“6. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.

“7. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.

“8. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

“9. If any man have an ear let him hear.

“10. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.

“11. And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spoke as a dragon.

“12. And he exercised all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed.

“13. And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.

“14. And he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should

make an image to the beast, which had the wound by the sword and did live.

“15. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

“16. And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads.

“17. And that no man might buy or sell save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

“18. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast : for it is the number of a man ; and his number is six hundred three score and six.”

Before attempting to give an exposition of this chapter, or to define what these beasts represent, it is necessary to notice the character and use of symbolic language.

Language is a vehicle of thought, a medium through which to communicate ideas. The word *tiger* means, or designates a certain animal. There may be, and frequently is, no resemblance between the sound, the name, and the thing signified. But men have agreed that the letters t-i-g-e-r shall convey to the mind the idea of that animal ; and so of other things. But the terms tiger, or lion, or lamb, &c., may be applied *figuratively* to a man, when he is supposed to possess dispositions, or traits of character, like those animals. Thus we say such an one is a tiger, a lion, a lamb. The idea that he is *like* the animal the name of which has been mentioned, is conveyed to the mind.

Symbolic language is the representation of one thing by another. A city set on a hill is a representation, or symbol, of the Church. An angel flying in the midst

of heaven having the everlasting Gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, is a representation of the holy ministers of the Gospel going into all the world to preach its good tidings to every creature. A lamb in the midst of the throne, as seen by John, symbolizes the Son of God as the great atoning sacrifice for sinners. The four beasts, seen by Daniel in prophetic vision, the lion, the bear, the leopard, and the fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, represented four kingdoms.

In symbolic language there is always some close resemblance; must be some striking similitude to the object represented. A tyrannical monarchy, a blood-thirsty nation, are symbolized by a ferocious beast; a pure church by a chaste, lovely female: a fallen, corrupt one, by a harlot. The *law*, then, of *symbolic language, is analogy.*

A large portion of the Apocalypse is written in this language. The seals, the trumpets, the vials, the sun, the moon, and the stars; the woman clothed with the sun, the woman sitting on the beast, the heavens and the earth; the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, the great red dragon, and the two beasts, &c., are all symbols. Several of them in the seventeenth chapter are explained by the angel, who was with John when these mighty panoramic scenes passed before him. The ten horns of the beast are ten kings; the seven heads, seven mountains, or powers; the woman, Babylon the Great, described in that chapter, that great city, or church, which reigneth over the kings of the earth; the waters, people and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.

The language of symbols is uniform as well as the language of words. A symbol, used by a writer to convey an idea, must be used, if at all, to convey that idea, and no other, throughout: otherwise, everything would be inextricable confusion. This is especially, emphatically so in the Apocalypse. Everything is uniform, distinct, clear. In the mighty machinery of seals, and trumpets, and suns, and angels, and beasts, &c., everything has its own, its peculiar meaning, and that meaning till the scene is closed. If, therefore, we can divine the meaning of these types, we have the key that unlocks this mysterious book. The import of many of them we know. The angel's explanation has lifted the veil and put the key in our hands.

What or whom, then, does the *beast, with seven heads and ten horns, symbolize?* The Roman, or as it is frequently called, the German empire, which rose up upon the ruins of the old Roman empire. The fourth beast in the vision of Daniel typed, all know, that ancient, powerful empire. That beast and the one seen by John are similar, if not the same, representing the empire when Pagan and when Roman Catholic. The beast seen by Daniel had ten horns; so had the one seen by John. In each vision these horns were explained to be ten kings, who were to come into being, and reign in the then future. The one seen by John, the angel, in his explanation in the xvii. ch. 8 v. said, "*Was, and is not, and yet is.*" He "*was*" when the old Roman empire was Pagan and persecuting. "*Is not,*" when the empire, under Constantine the Great, became Christian. His ferocity, his persecuting, blood-thirsty spirit, was then annihilated by the benign, pure

religion of Jesus Christ. The beast was changed to a lamb—"is not." "*And yet is.*" He re-appeared in the new empire, whose religion, intolerant and persecuting, was and is Roman Catholic. The beast was, and is not, and yet is: *Pagan Rome, Christian Rome, Papal Rome*, as to religion. And let it be remembered, that it was, and is, a beast, or not, according to its disposition, its religion. The visions, then, in part, run into each other. Daniel's swept down to the time of the re-appearance of the empire as Roman Catholic in religion, with its ten horns; and John's went back and embraced it as Pagan.

That this beast symbolizes the Holy Roman Empire, as it was called, sometimes the Italian, and now the German, which was built up by Charlemagne upon the ruins of the old one which had been swept away by the barbarian hordes from the North, will more plainly appear if we closely examine his appearance, his character, and his acts.

He "*rose up out of the sea.*" This empire came into being when society, the multitudes, the nations, &c., were troubled and tossed as the sea.

He had "*seven heads.*" In this empire as its heads, or the mountains or powers on which it rested, was an electoral college, composed of seven of the most important principalities of the empire, which was established by the "Golden Bull" in 1356. The seven electors were the Archbishops of Metz, Cologne, and Triers, the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatine, the Duke of Savoy, and the Margrave of Brandenburg, who elected the emperor and were the foundation and strength of the empire. These were the seven heads.

"*Upon his heads the name of blasphemy.*" "A blasphemy," says Dr. Clarke, "is the prostitution of a *sacred* name to an unholy use." "*I know the blasphemy of them who say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.*" "The name of blasphemy," he adds, "is very properly said to be upon the seven heads of the beast, or the seven electorates of the German Empire, because the electors are styled: SACRI Imperii Principes Electores; Princes, Electors of the *Holy* Empire: SACRI Romani Imperii Electores; Electors of the *Holy* Roman Empire."

"*And of his heads as it were, was wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed.*" This wounding occurred in 1623, and the deadly wound was healed in 1648.

The Palatine Elector, Frederick V., who, for accepting the crown of Bohemia, the Bohemians preferring him to Ferdinand II., was put under the ban of the empire, his prerogatives and honors wrested from him, and his territories given to the Duke of Bavaria. At the treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the Lower Palatine was restored to Charles Louis, son of the *deposed* elector, with the prerogatives and honors of his father. The Upper Palatinate, still held by the Duke, was to revert to him if the former should have no male issue. This head was wounded by the sword to death, but was healed.

"The *ten horns*," the angel, in the seventeenth chapter, explained to be, "*ten kings.*"

These were the ten barbarian kingdoms which sprung up from the vast ruins of the old empire, and were in the new. Dr. Clarke thus gives their names: "1. The

kingdom of the Huns; 2. The kingdom of the Astrogths; 3. The kingdom of the Visigoths; 4. The kingdom of the Franks; 5. The kingdom of the Vandals; 6. The kingdom of the Sueres and Alans; 7. The kingdom of the Burgundians; 8. The kingdom of the Heruli, Rugii, Scyrri, and other tribes, which composed the Italian kingdom of Odoacor; 9. The kingdom of the Saxons; and, 10. The kingdom of the Lombards."

He "*was like unto a leopard.*" The empire was composed of different nations and tongues, almost as diversified as the *spots* of a leopard.

"*And his feet were as the feet of a bear.*" This may have reference to the north-eastern extremities of the empire, known to be exceedingly wild and ferocious. His wildness and ferocity are meant.

"*And his mouth as the mouth of a lion.*" "This figure," says one, "is to be understood as expressing the character of the head and government of the empire. The mouth utters its commands; and when Charlemagne spoke, it was as when the lion roareth in the forest, the beasts everywhere tremble."

"*And the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.*" Who was the dragon? In the twelfth chapter we have this description:

"*And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads.*"

Some have supposed that this dragon symbolizes Satan; but whenever John speaks of Satan it is in such language that we cannot misapprehend him. He speaks of him without any symbol, as Satan, the old serpent,

&c. Besides, Satan, I presume, has not *seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads.*

Some have supposed that this dragon represents popery. This is as unreasonable and untenable as the view just noticed. Popery has not seven heads and crowns upon them, and ten horns. Besides, popery is symbolized in juxtaposition by the two-horned beast.

This dragon was the old Roman empire. Its seven heads with crowns were the seven forms of governments through which that empire passed. The beast, or new empire, succeeded to the seat and power and great authority of the old empire or dragon.

The color of the dragon indicates his sanguinary disposition. He was *red*—*red* with the blood of the saints—Pagan Rome was. And so the beast to whom he gave place, made war with the saints and overcame them. The German empire has made war with the saints for a thousand years. They have been overcome, and their blood, by this beast, as by the red dragon, has been poured out as water.

The "beast," then, to notice no other marks, with "seven heads and ten horns," who succeeded to the seat and power of the great red dragon, is *the Holy Roman Empire*, now the German empire.

What or whom does the "*beast*" with "*two horns like a lamb,*" and who "*spake as a dragon,*" symbolize? Popery, beyond all doubt. Every mark, every peculiarity, prefigures and finds its prototype in that monstrous system of corruption and wickedness and colossal power. The name can be applied to, means nothing else. The beast-picture is filled up in all its savage outlines and dark proportions only by popery.

This beast *rose up "out of the earth."* He came up, not like the one with seven heads and ten horns, amid revolutions and wars, and the commotions and throes of civil society, but in a settled state of the empire, and without having to fight his way into being, and power, and dominion. He rose up without opposition and commotions, and is of this world—of "the earth"—not of God. Just so popery rose up, and such it is.

He had "two horns like a lamb." Horns symbolize kings, or rather the dominion, and power, and authority of kings. Popery claims universal, spiritual, and temporal dominion. The world is his, and the fulness thereof, the Pope declares; and he has exercised supreme spiritual and temporal authority. "Kings are his playthings, nations his outposts."* These are the horns of the beast.

These horns were "like a lamb's." This denotes that the beast was of ecclesiastical origin, or pretensions. His power would be claimed to be of divine right; and though wielded with the might and ferocity of a beast, yet in appearance very innocent. How clearly and unmistakable does this type popery.

"He spake as a dragon." His horns belied his nature, his voice revealed him to be a dragon. Read the mandates of the Church of Rome; listen to the bulls of Gregory VII., Innocent III., Urban VIII., Paul IV., Pius V., &c., and even Pius IX., and hear the voice of the beast as the voice of a dragon.

"And he exercised all the power of the first beast before him." Before him, imports in his presence. Popery

* See Chapter V. of this work,—Spiritual and Temporal Supremacy.

has exercised all the power of the old Roman, or of the German empire. Nay, all the powers of Christendom were at one time at the feet of the Pope.

"And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men. And he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast." What a graphic description of popery! What Church, or people, under heaven, who has any other mark of the beast, pretends to work miracles, and to make fire to come down from heaven, but the Church of Rome? We have already seen that she claims and pretends to exercise such power.

"Saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by the sword, and did live." The dwellers on the earth were those among whom he rose up, and over whom he exercised dominion—the fallen Church of Rome.

The "image"—what does it mean? It was to be an image of, or something exactly like, the first beast. *That beast was a civil despotism*, exercised by the nobility and military, the seven heads and ten horns, with the emperor at their head—a *political hierarchy*, if an ecclesiastical term may be applied to temporals. The image, therefore, would be a *spiritual despotic hierarchy*. Such was made and now exists in the Church of Rome, at the instigation and command of the Pope. The hierarchy, consisting of cardinals, patriarchs, metropolitans, archbishops and bishops, with the Pope at their head, is an *image*, a *fac-simile*, of the beast, with its seven electoral heads and ten horns, or kings.

"And he had power to give life unto the image," &c. Into this hierarchy the Pope has breathed life, and it is a living image. It does indeed speak, and causes as many as will not worship it to be killed.

"And he causeth all," &c., "to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads." The mark is simply the impress of the false doctrines taught. The followers and worshippers of the beast would, by a law of our nature, reflect his image; and show in their foreheads, or intellects, and in their hands, or acts, that they are imbued with his spirit; stamped, sealed with his seal: does not popery thus "mark the faithful" in their foreheads and in their hands? This view is confirmed by the following verse: *"And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark."*

Councils, and Popes, and priests, have decreed and taught, that Roman Catholics must not buy of, or sell to heretics; they *"must not harbor or cherish them in their houses, or have any traffic with them."* So decreed the Council of Tours. None but the faithful, in thoroughly Roman Catholic countries, are to enjoy such immunities. The mark of the beast, the reception of, and belief in popery, must be in the forehead or in the hand, or the good papist is commanded not to have anything to do with them in *"buying or selling; that being thus deprived of the comforts of humanity, they may be compelled to repent of the error of their ways."* Thus decreed the Council of Lateran, with Pope Alexander III. at its head.

"The pagan dragon, Dioclesian," says Mr. Mede, "made just such another edict in his time, viz., 'That

*no man must sell or administer anything to the Christians, unless they had first burnt incense to the gods.' "**

And in countries where the Church of Rome is dominant, whenever her doctrines and claims are rejected, and she excommunicates, and thus takes the "mark" off the offender, all forsake him, even his relatives, as abandoned of God, and none will have any dealings with him. He is more offensive and dreaded than a leper, and is left to die. Dr. Murray, in his letters to Archbishop Hughes, gives the case of a miller in Ireland, who, for reading the Bible, was anathematized with bell, book, and candle, and all his Roman Catholic friends and neighbors forsook him, and but for a few Protestants he would have perished. A thousand of such cases might be given.

But this buying and selling doubtless symbolizes *spiritual traffic*. And who buys and sells the grace of God but the Church of Rome? And who has any right, according to her teaching, except those who have the mark of the beast, to deal in this merchandise?

Rome has decreed, and firmly holds, that there are no means of salvation but in her pale—and these are mostly auricular confession, priestly absolution, indulgences, masses, extreme unction and purgatory; and they are sold and bought.

"Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred threescore and six."
 This is a most important revelation. That we may know who the beast is, or what he symbolizes, his number is given, and the number of his name. They

* Quoted by Ousley.

are one. Is there, then, any power which meets the description already given—any Church, for we must look for something under the name of the Church, whose number and the number of whose name is 666?

Until the tenth century, letters were used as numerals. I stood for 1, L for 50, C for 100, &c. The number of a Church, or of a name, therefore, is the sum of the numerical letters which compose that name. Thus, the number of Jerusalem is 1637: J—c=250, r=80, u—s=7, a—l=50, e=250, m=1000=1637. Now, the Greek term (and John wrote in Greek) used by the ancients, and now used by the Greeks, to designate the Roman Catholic Church, *λατεινος*, *Lateinos*, contains this number. Thus, λ=30, α=1, τ=300, ε=5, ι=10, ν=50, ο=70, ς=200=666. And the Church of Rome is emphatically *a*, or the *Latin Church*. Latin is the language in which her laws and theology are written; her prayers and her ritual are in Latin; and Latin, though a dead language, is her language among all people everywhere. She calls herself the Latin Church; though now generally the Roman, or Holy Roman Catholic. She is, then, in the sense the term indicates, essentially Latin. She is the beast.

Ireneus, in commenting on this passage says, "The name *Lateinos* contains the number 666, and this is most like truth, because the last kingdom (the Roman) hath this name, for they are Latins who now reign."* He applied it to the Latin kingdom, but the Church had not then apostatized. *Then* it prophetically typed the Latin Church; *now* it shows her to be the prototype.

Here then is wisdom, or demonstration, as this Greek

* Quoted by Ousley.

imports. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man;* and his number is six hundred threescore and six.

It may be objected, that if popery, as has been argued, be the two-horned beast, then the Roman Church is not. But popery and that Church are essentially and inseparably one; they stand or fall together. And the prophet has symbolized both, as of necessity, the one and the same great apostasy.

The prophet in the seventeenth chapter describes the apostate Church under the symbol of a corrupt woman.

“ 1. And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters;

“ 2. With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.

“ 3. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.

“ 4. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.

“ 5. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.

“ 6. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.”

This woman represents a fallen, corrupt Church; a

* Latienos was the founder of the Latin Kingdom, whence the name Latin Kingdom—Latin Church.

Church deeply fallen and foully corrupt. The angel, in verse 18, explains her to be that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth, and a city symbolizes a Church. This view is entertained, I believe, almost without a dissenting voice, by the learned of all parties, Roman Catholic and Protestant. Babylon the Great, the city, the woman, all say, symbolically represents the fallen Church, the apostasy. What Church does this woman symbolize? The delineation of her character and description of her person, so graphically drawn by John, leaves no doubt that it is the Church of Rome.

She "*sitteth upon many waters.*" Waters "*are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.*" (V. 15.) She also "*sitteth upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.*" This beast, as we have seen, is the Holy Roman, or German empire. The multitudes, &c., are subjects of the empire, and also members of the Church. Sitting upon the beast represents that she is the *established religion*, and that as a *rider* she *guides and controls* him. Could anything more clearly have pointed out the Church of Rome? This prophecy has become history.

"*With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication.*" This symbolizes *spiritual* unchastity—the practice of deep, vile corruptions in the name of religion. The cause of this fornication is given in the remaining part of the verse: "*The inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.*" "The symbol," says Wickes, "is taken from the cup of drugged wine with which lewd women

were accustomed to inflame their lovers." The wine of her fornication, or corrupt doctrines, produces a moral stupor like intoxication, and hence kings and the multitudes are corrupted, and greedily practice with her, like the fallen Jewish Church of old, spiritual lewdness. And "nothing but the stupor of moral intoxication could have induced the people to buy as greedily as they did, the Pope's indulgences; and to yield themselves the easy dupes of the pious frauds and impositions practiced upon them by their spiritual teachers."*

"And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet-color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication." The golden cup symbolizes the means of graces, of which she professes to be the only depository and almoner; but instead of its being filled with the "water of life" to satiate the thirst of the dying, and save them, it is full of the deadly poison of error.

The scarlet-color, gold, precious stones, &c., represent the gorgeous ceremonies, imposing processions, costly displays, and splendid rites of the apostate Church. And how clearly they point out the Church of Rome; how fully, to the very letter, are they fulfilled in her habiliments and splendidly imposing ceremonies! Indeed, this passage might be construed literally, for Rome clothes herself in scarlet color, and is decked with gold and precious stones, &c. Indeed, if a rhetorician had been employed to write a description of her gorgeous ceremonies and the color and

* *Apocalypse Unveiled.*

splendor of the dresses of her rulers, the Pope, and Cardinals, and Bishops,* he could not have more fully and clearly described them than John has.

"And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, &c."

Babylon is another symbol of the apostate Church. Or, this is mystically the name of the woman who symbolizes the apostasy. Roman Catholic writers affirm that Babylon represents the city of Rome when Pagan. But the woman who bore this name was not a *literal* city, or the symbol of one; for she was *upon the beast*; and if the beast was either the old *Pagan* Roman Empire, or the *Holy* Roman Empire, and Romanists assert the former, then the *city of Rome was a part of him*. This would make nonsense of the passage. The beast was upon the beast! Besides, the woman was upon the beast with *ten horns* and *crowns* upon them, not the beast of Daniel or old empire. The ten horns or kings made their appearance, came into existence *after* the destruction of the old empire. Babylon, therefore, does not, in any sense, symbolize the *city* of Rome. It symbolizes a corrupt Church, and that Church is Rome.

The only meaning I can attach to the word "*mystery*," confirms this view. "In the Greek," says Wickes, "the word 'mystery' is not reckoned as one of the names, as in our translation, but is separated by a pause, and stands in apposition with the words preceding. The meaning is as follows: And upon her forehead

* Scarlet is a favorite color at Rome. Scarlet caps, cloaks and slippers are worn, especially by the Cardinals. They ride in scarlet-colored carriages. Gold and precious stones are profusely worn.

was a name written, which is a mystery." And when we trace the history of the Church of Rome and examine her doctrines, and practice, and assumptions—the corruptions that fester in her bosom, while she proclaims that she cannot err—her bitter persecuting spirit, in utter antagonism to the gentle spirit of Jesus and the pure teachings and practice of the apostles, we understand the meaning of the term "*mystery*." The Church of Rome is, indeed, a mystery. But was the city of Rome as the seat of the old Roman empire a mystery?

"*And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.*" What a startling, sickening figure! Drunken, intoxicated, frenzied, not with wine, but with *blood*, with the *blood of martyrs!* with the *blood of the martyrs of Jesus!* And who, that this woman can possibly symbolize, has drunk to intoxication the blood of the saints, but the Church of Rome? She has drunk the blood of millions. Her prisons have echoed with the agonizing wail of the "martyrs of Jesus," and her engines of torture have groaned with their breaking bones, and her places of execution have witnessed their consuming flesh and blood smoking in the flame. This harlot, drunken with blood, is the Church of Rome; the Church of Rome is the Great Apostasy.

Every prediction, then, of the working of the mystery of iniquity in the Church—the falling away, the revelation of the Man of Sin, the departure from the faith, the uprising of the ferocious beast, lamb-like in appearance, but a dragon, and the corrupt woman intoxicated with blood—all, all, concurrently point out,

désignate, symbolize the Church of Rome; and every mark, every feature, every shape, and form, and trait of character, her position and name, and faith and practice — all meet in, and are fulfilled, by her. And no other Church or association under heaven meets and answers these descriptions, fulfils these predictions. She is the apostasy—is Antichrist. Nor is the force of this conclusion broken by the cry, that the Church of Rome is the oldest, the first Church. The history of the Jewish Church clearly demonstrates that a priesthood may become corrupt and be rejected of the God who instituted it; that a Church may fall away and become His enemy, and incur His displeasure and curse. The history of the Seven Churches of Asia, especially the Church of Laodicia, proves this. And the prophecies we have just been considering, show beyond all question that there would come a falling away in the Church, that the Man of Sin would rise up in her midst and sit in the temple of God, and teach doctrines of devils. The objection, then, the argument, if I may so call it, that the Church of Rome has come down from the apostles, has not only no force in it, but is a sophism. Is the Church of Rome what the Apostolic Church was? Has she come down to us as Jesus Christ laid her deep foundations and reared her bulwarks and towers? Are her doctrines and her practice the same? These are the questions which have a direct logical bearing upon the great issues before us, and which, if answered in the negative—and so only in truth they can be answered—show the sophistry of this objection, and demonstrate our position. In a word, is the Church of

Rome to day, what the Church was in the apostles' day? No, verily; as we have seen, and will more fully see, when we come to examine thoroughly her doctrines, and practice, and assumptions. Now, God has decided, if anything is decided in his Word, that the doctrine, once a Church always a Church, once a priest always a priest, though unfaithful and corrupt, *is false*. The Church that becomes corrupt, the priest that is ungodly, cease to be the spouse and minister of Jesus Christ. To maintain the contrary is to maintain a monstrous absurdity, and a most wicked, damning dogma. If a corrupt Church is the Church of Jesus Christ still, can do the work of her Lord, to wit, save souls, then not only are wicked men saved,—they compose the Church, and the Church which is his spouse, must be saved,—but heaven has become hell, and all distinctions between virtue and vice, sin and holiness, are annihilated. Although this is a favorite subterfuge with Rome, and sometimes great stress is laid upon it, it would be almost an insult to the good sense and intelligence of the reader to notice it further. Sin is hateful to God in any being, and turns away from that being His favor and brings upon him His wrath. An apostate Church, therefore, is rejected of God, and there is no salvation in her pale. The Man of Sin is not the channel of grace to the world, his acts are not divinely, spiritually valid. Christ has no part with Antichrist.

CHAPTER II.

SOURCE AND RULE OF FAITH.

IN the preceding chapter I have shown that the Supreme Head of the Church predicted a great falling away ; and, in general terms, that the Church of Rome, in name, position, doctrine, and practice, fulfils the prediction. Before proceeding to examine more fully her doctrines, and practice, and assumptions, that the picture, in outline and detail, may be complete, it is absolutely necessary to ascertain, to know beyond all doubt, *the source and rule of faith* to which our ultimate appeal must be made, and by which the points in controversy are to be determined. What, then, is the *source and rule of faith*? *The Bible*, say we. *The Bible and tradition*, say Roman Catholics.

"*Tradition*," the Council of Trent decreed, "*is of equal authority with the Scriptures.*" Nor was this an entirely new dogma. For over five hundred years tradition had been appealed to as of great authority in matters of faith. Indeed, even Popes, and bishops, and divines, had affirmed, that it is of equal authority with Holy Writ; and some, that it is above scripture. Under Leo X., and by his sanction, Prierio said, "He is a heretic whosoever does not rest on the *doctrine* of the Roman Church, and of the Roman Pontiff *as the infallible rule of faith, from which Holy Scripture itself*

derives its force and its authority." This point gained, this dogma forever settled, (and an infallible council has since decreed it,) Rome can prove almost anything. Infallibility, auricular confession, priestly absolution, transubstantiation, purgatory, the supreme spiritual and temporal power of the Pope, all, all may be sustained. Tradition, running back a century or two, or four or five, or six hundred years, establishes all—proves them to be of *divine origin*! And yet they are not only not of divine origin, but contrary to the commandments and teaching of the Head of the Church and His inspired Apostles. This in order I shall show. Hence, when tradition and Holy Scripture disagree—and disagree they do at almost every turn—the weight of authority is given, and obedience rendered to the former by the Church of Rome, and Scripture is thrown aside. Soon after the close of the Council of Trent, Pius IV. prepared the oath to be taken by all ecclesiastics. A part of it runs thus:

"I firmly embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all the constitutions of the mother church; moreover, I admit Holy Scripture according to the *sense* which the said church holds, and has held," (that of course is according to tradition,) "to which church it appertains to judge."

"I firmly embrace tradition!" "Moreover, I admit holy Scripture!" Is not this putting tradition, in every sense, above Scripture? Cardinal Bellarmine, an oracle with Rome, says, "We shall endeavor to demonstrate that the Scriptures, without the traditions, are neither sufficient, nor simply necessary." Then, tradition is first, above, and all in all. Take that away, and man, benighted, erring man, has no "lamp unto his feet, nor

light unto his path." Baronius, another champion of Rome, says, "Tradition is the foundation of the Scriptures, and *surpasses* them in this, to wit, that the *Scriptures cannot subsist unless fortified by tradition*, whereas *tradition has sufficient force without Scripture*." Coster affirms, "The excellence of the non-written word far surpasses that of the Scriptures. Tradition comprises in itself *all truth*.* We ought not to appeal from it to any other judge." "Scripture," adds Lindanus, "*is a nose of wax, a dead letter that kills, a very husk without a kernel, a leaden rule, a school for heretics, a forest that serves as a refuge for robbers*."† These quotations might be extended. But surely here is enough to satisfy every candid, unprejudiced mind, that while Rome declares that the *Bible and Tradition* are the source, and the rule of faith, *tradition* is first and last. Scripture is nothing without tradition, "cannot subsist without it, whereas tradition has sufficient force without Scripture." "The *non-written word comprises in itself all truth*." What, then, corrupt popes have decreed, what fallible doctors have said, what councils-general have decreed—and they have decreed Arianism at one Council and the contrary at another—these things compose the *Bible* of Roman Catholics. Can the candid reader resist the conclusion, that Rome has "departed from the faith, and gives heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils"? •

To return: The Scripture, say we, say all Protestants, is the rule of faith, the *only* source and rule of faith. It can "subsist" alone, and "*comprises in itself*

* The converse is certainly nearer the truth

† Quoted by Bungener.

ALL TRUTH." What say the early Fathers? Those holy men who lived *immediately* after the Apostles, before the "mystery of iniquity," with its corrupt leaven, had spread through the Church. Hear Ireneus, he who was "a disciple of a disciple of John": "The Gospel was first preached by the Apostles; then *by the will of God, they wrote it, in order that it might become the foundation and pillar of our faith.*" "We must," he adds, "necessarily appeal to the testimony of the Scriptures, *without which our discourses are entitled to no credit.*" "Our discourses are entitled to no credit without the Scriptures"! Infallible Rome has decreed the contrary. Those very discourses, she affirms, the tradition of that day, are of equal authority with the Gospel; nay, they have "sufficient force to subsist without Scripture," for they "comprise in themselves all truth."

Tertullian, writing against a similar error in his day, says: "Let the disciples of Hermogenes *show that what they teach is written*; and *if it be not written*, let them tremble at the anathema pronounced on whosoever *takes from or adds to Scripture.*"

"It is necessary that every one instruct himself, by means of the divine Scriptures, in the necessary verities, both that he may make progress in piety, and *not accustom himself to human traditions.* *What is written, do thou believe; what is not written, seek thou not after.*" So wrote, so taught St. Basil.

St. Ambrose taught: "If you *take away or add aught* to Scripture, this seems to be a prevarication. When the Scriptures do not speak, who shall speak?"

"Let us not stop," wrote St. Augustine, "at what I

have said, or you have said, but at *what the Lord hath said*. We have the Lord's books, there let us look for the Church." Augustine, hadst thou lived in this our day, thou hadst been called a Protestant heretic, and been given over to the tender mercies of the devil. "Look to the Lord's books for the Church"? "Nay, nay!" the aroused spirit of Rome replies, "*Look to tradition.*"

The eloquent Chrysostom says: "*When impious heresy shall occupy the churches, know that then there will be no proof of true faith but by Holy Scripture. HAVE RECOURSE, THEREFORE, ONLY TO IT, FOR THOSE WHO GO ELSEWHERE SHALL PERISH.*" Was he right? Rome acknowledges him as a true son of the Church, and receives his writings and sayings as a part of tradition. Then, Rome being judge, tradition being infallible authority, "*impious heresy occupies*" her "churches," and they "*shall perish.*" But why make these reflections? Every reader must see this at a glance. Were she not blind, and her "conscience seared with a hot iron," Rome, too, could see it. But these passages, and all similar ones, have been stricken out of the works of the Fathers published by Rome. Nothing shall contravene her in her purpose of doing her pleasure.

The ruling spirit of the Council of Nice, Athanasius, says—and the Council were one with him: "The Scriptures *suffice of themselves alone*, for making known the truth. We are resolved to listen to nothing, to say nothing, beyond what *has been written*. It is a *mockery* to raise questions or discussions on what has not been written."

Let us hear St. Augustine once more: "Under

pretext of the Lord's having said, 'I have yet more things to say to you,' *heretics* try to give a plausible color to their *inventions*. But if the Lord has not said, who among us will venture to say: It is this, it is that! And if he is rash enough to say it, how will he prove it? And who will be presumptuous enough to affirm, without any divine testimony, that what he says, even although it were true, is precisely what the Lord meant to say." "Rash, presumptuous," is it? but Rome "ventures" to "invent," "to say," to decree it. She is infallible, and in virtue of that "invents, says," decrees that tradition is of equal authority with Scripture; and then proves her infallibility by tradition! Is not the "*vicious circle*" the ground and pillar of Rome? But more of this hereafter.

For the first eight centuries, the faith of the Church, in every sense, rested entirely on Scripture. And all the decrees of all the Councils, Nice, Ephesus, Chalcedon, &c., were drawn from, and based upon, this infallible authority. If any allusion was made to tradition, it was not as of equal authority with the Scriptures, but as fallible history that had come down with the Gospel. The history of the Church—her teachings, her conflicts, her sufferings, her triumphs—was *uninspired*, and therefore had no authority as a rule of faith. No article of faith was drawn from, or predicated of it. In matters so essential, it was of no more authority with the Fathers, the evangelical theologians of that period, than the *History of the Diet of Worms* is with us. Now, if the Church for eight hundred years declared tradition to be of no authority as a rule of faith, but pernicious and destructive when appealed to as

such, as some heretics had done; and if she declared repeatedly and always that the "Scriptures comprise in themselves all truth;" that they, and they alone, are a sufficient, the only rule of faith—is not the question settled? And what right has Rome now, in the face of all this, to decree the contrary? By virtue of her infallibility? But the Church, she affirms, is a unit, and the same in all ages. If infallible now, she was infallible then. But then she rejected tradition and kept exclusively to Holy Scripture! And then, she claimed not the attribute of infallibility, but reiterated a thousand and one times that the Word of God only was infallible. How will the Romanist escape these dilemmas? how bridge the mighty gulf between him and the Church in her pure, early days? Truly, the dogma of infallibility is a *chimera*, and tradition a *foundation of sand*!

Turn we to the Scriptures themselves. What is their voice on this momentous question? What has Jesus taught? What the apostles? Hear St. Paul:

*"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."**

"Now to Him that is of power to establish you according to my Gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith."†

"For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for

* 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

† Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

our learning, *that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.*"

"If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard, which was preached to every creature."*

Now, inspiration affirms, in these passages, and who will deny, that God has given "Scripture for doctrine," &c., that the *man of God* may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished* unto all good works; that He has "*made known*" his will by "*the preaching of Jesus Christ*" and "*the Scriptures of the prophets*," "to all nations for the obedience of faith," that "we might have hope;" and that being "grounded and settled in the faith," we might "not be moved away (by tradition?) from this hope of the Gospel." Is not Scripture, then, according to the voice of God, the only source and rule of faith?

On the other hand, listen to what the Scriptures say concerning *tradition*:

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, *after the tradition of men.*" A caution that it would have been well for the souls of men, for Rome to have observed.*

"I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ *unto another Gospel*: Which is not another;" (there cannot be another; it is vain "philosophy or tradition;") "but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we HAVE PREACHED unto you, let him be accursed."

"Why do thy disciples transgress the *tradition* of the elders?" asked the devout, tradition-loving Pharisees of Jesus, "for," they said, "they wash not their hands when they eat bread?" "But he answered and said unto them, why do ye also transgress the *commandment of God* by your *tradition*?" "Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias pro-

* Col. i. 23.

phesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.”*

St. Mark gives this remarkable conversation almost in the precise words of St. Matthew :†

“Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the *tradition* of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you, hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth me their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit in vain do they worship me, *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*. For, *laying aside the commandment of God*, ye hold the *tradition of men*. And he said unto them, Full well ye *reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition*.” “Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered.”

The Elders and Pharisees were members of, some of them priests and rulers in, the Jewish Church. God had promised to be with, guide, bless and protect that Church. Had they not a right, therefore, to “deliver” tradition, or to decree that it was of equal authority with Scripture? Jesus declared that they had no such right, or authority; and further, that *their tradition had made of none effect the commandments of God*. Their tradition, therefore, was the height of presumption and wickedness.

If, then, the Jewish Church, priests and elders, as is here clearly taught by the Saviour, had no right to “deliver tradition,” or decree it to be a source and rule of faith, but in wickedly attempting to do so made the

* Matt. xv. 2, &c.

† Mark vii. 5, &c.

Word of God of none effect; the Church of Rome, by parity of reasoning, has no such right: She has no promise or presence of God; no grace and inspiration denied the former. In decreeing tradition, therefore, to be of equal, I may very safely say, superior authority to the Scripture, she has transcended her prerogatives, and wickedly "departed from the faith."

And finally, the great apostle of the Gentiles solemnly avers that *tradition* led him into grievous blasphemies, persecutions, and ignorant sins. Hear his earnest, startling words:*

"As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." * * * "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is *not after man*. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and wasted it; and profited in the Jews religion above many my equals in mine own nation, *being more exceedingly zealous of the TRADITIONS of my fathers*." * * * "But I obtained mercy, who was before a *blasphemer*, and a *persecutor* and *injurious*, because I did it *ignorantly in unbelief*."†

What! an ignorant unbeliever, and yet "being more exceeding zealous of the traditions of the fathers! What! persecuting zeal, according to tradition blasphemous, injurious and damning!"

Now the conclusion is clear and inevitable, that the Bible is the only source and rule of faith. And any other view is not only illogical and absurd, but derogatory to the character of the divine lawgiver. For if

* Galatians i. 9, &c.

† 1 Tim. i. 13.

God has revealed himself to man, that revelation must contain all things pertaining to faith and morals necessary to salvation. This, thank God, is the view, the doctrine of Protestants. "The Holy Scriptures," say we, "contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." We have, therefore, thrown our banner to the breeze with this inscription, "The Bible, the Bible, the religion of Protestants!" upon its ample folds. That banner, in heaven's own pure breezes, shall wave over every moral battle-field where "the sacramental hosts of God's elect" shall go,—

"Till earth's remotest nation
Has learned Messiah's name!"

and the "philosophy, and vain deceit, and tradition of men," shall have been swept away!

What writings or books compose the Bible? or what is the canon of Scripture? is a question of almost equal importance with the one just under review, and one about which Roman Catholics and Protestants as widely differ. The latter receive thirty-nine books of the Old Testament: the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses, the Historical books, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the first and second books of Samuel, first and second books of Kings, first and second books of Chronicles, the book of Ezra, of Nehemiah, of Esther; the Poetical books Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Cantica, or Songs of Solomon, and Lamentations of Jeremiah; the Prophetical books, four prophets the

greater, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, and twelve prophets the less, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; and all the books of the New Testament. Roman Catholics receive all these books, and so far we are agreed; but they receive also, as inspired and canonical, the Apocryphal books, the first and second books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, the Song of the Three Children, the story of Susanna, the story of Bel and the Dragon, and the first and second books of Maccabees, and the additions to the book of Esther. The Council of Trent, at its fourth session, solemnly decreed these books to be of equal rank and authority with the inspired writings of Moses, and the Prophets and Apostles, and took them into the sacred canon of Scripture.

The history of this decree, by Bungener,* and his acute reflections, throw much light on this question, and in connection with a few thoughts I shall offer, demonstrate that Rome is as deeply in error touching this matter as on the question of tradition. He says:

“The Council was called upon to state precisely where it (Scripture) was to be found, and what the books are which compose it.

“How happened it that such questions still remained to be decided? To be infallible, and to remain for fifteen centuries without saying precisely what went to make up the Bible, was, on the Church's part, either a singular forgetfulness of her mission, or a singular avowal of her impotence. And one cannot say here, that if she had neglected to pronounce, it was because there was no doubt on the subject. The discussion showed that there was more than one.

* See Bungener's History of the Council of Trent, p. 83.

"Does not the Church in arrogating to herself this absolute right of teaching, and of being the only teacher, authorize us to demand of her a reckoning of what she has not done, as well as of what she has done? An infallible authority charged with the regulation of the faith, and a fundamental question that has remained for ages doubtful, will always, people may say what they will, present a contradiction. What is certain is, that on the 7th of April, 1546, the day before that on which the Council's decision came to be known, there was not a single Roman Catholic in the whole world that could tell, either of his own authority, for none had the right to do so, or on his Church's part, seeing she had never formally pronounced her opinion—the exact number of the canonical books. 'Many,' says Pallavicini,* 'lived in the most distressing ignorance with regard to this; the same book being adored by some as the expression of the Holy Ghost, and execrated by others as the work of a sacrilegious imposter.'" "The divisions of Protestants on this subject," adds Bungener, "have never gone nearly so far as this.

"The discussion was warm, and even, in some respects, sufficiently learned, but not on the part of the bishops."

It is just to remark, however, as Bungener elsewhere states, that a few of them were men of "high theological capacity."

"Here, then," he adds, "should be the place for noticing the intervention of that other class of members, the divines, who had been called to the Council for the purpose of elucidating the questions under discussion, but without voting, that privilege being exclusively confined to bishops, mitred abbots, and the heads of religious orders. Their number was at all times much about the same as that of the voting members. Were we not too tired of the subject to return again to the question of infallibility,† viewed in the relation to forms, we might be tempted to ask if their presence accorded with the spirit of the system in virtue of which the body

* The approved Roman Catholic historian of the Council of Trent.

† See pp. 47, 48. See also Chap. III. of this work.

of bishops is alone infallible ; with the spirit, we say, for, as respects the letter, the reply would be, that they did not vote. A great many questions were, in fact, handed over to them ; the majority of votes was in many instances determined by the confidence reposed in their statements. The bishops were, doubtless, right in collecting all the elucidations possible ; but one can hardly understand how a court should remain incapable of error, and yet pronounce its sentences according to the *opinions of certain adepts who are not infallible*.

“ Nevertheless, in the question of the canonical books, the contrary was about to take place, for in that case the decision came from the bishops. Let us see how far this was to the honor of the Council.

“ The divines were unanimous in recognizing the inferiority of the books which Protestants regarded then, and still regard, as apocryphal. Could they hesitate? Josephus, Eusebius, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Cyril, Gregory of Nazianzen, Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine, Jerome above all, he who of all the Fathers had labored most on the Bible, speak of it as a generally acknowledged fact ; and if, after all that these have said, there is still some room for discussion as to the views they entertained of such or such a particular book of those in question, it is not the less beyond doubt that they all believed in the non-authenticity of some, and the inferiority of all.

“ Such, then, was the state of matters ; but this unanimity on the part of the divines, did not extend to their being agreed as to the rank to be assigned to those books in the Bible. Some wanted a simple statement of their inferiority, without determining the degree ; others, that they should be divided into two classes, one of which should serve as an intermediate between those universally admitted as canonical, and the apocryphal, which had been generally reputed as doubtful. A third party merely required that there should simply be a list drawn up, without explanation, of all the books ; and last of all, a fourth, consisting of but a feeble minority among the divines, without *denying* that the apocryphals had held hitherto a more or less *inferior rank*, proposed to put an end to the matter by declaring them canonical.

“ Will it be believed ? The last of these opinions carried the day.

This was to trample under foot the testimony of twenty Fathers ; it was to deny the superabundantly demonstrated fact, that the ancient Jews did not believe in the canonicity of those books ; it was to brave the general opinion of the Roman Catholics, as well as the recriminations of the Protestants ; it was even to overlook the scruples of the very divines of the Council. No matter ! Was the assembly not omnipotent ? And had the bishops been pleased to insert Plato's *Phædo*, or Aristotle's *Logic*, in the Bible, what could a Roman Catholic say against it ? Ah ! when we see how much sweating and sophistry it has cost during the last three centuries, in order to sustain this untenable decree, one may be allowed to think that the champions of Rome have more than once cursed, in their heart, the day on which so imprudent a denial was given to one of the most unquestionable facts in the whole history of the Church. But what is sadder still than the infatuation of the men who imagine that they could change the past as they fettered the future, is the impudent fury with which some would dare, down to this very day, to repeat that the Protestants mutilate the Bible ; and why ? Because, forsooth, they allow themselves to print it without those books which Rome herself, down to the Council of Trent, had never declared canonical !"

"The apocryphal books were not admitted into the canon of Scripture during the first four centuries of the Christian Church. They are not mentioned in the catalogue of inspired writings made by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the second century, nor in those of Origen, in the third century, of Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory of Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerome, Rufinus, and others of the fourth century ; nor in the catalogue of canonical books recognized by the Council of Laodicia, held in the same century, whose canons were received by the Catholic Church." *

The apocryphal books were written by Jews of Alexandria, some two or two hundred and fifty years before Christ ; *who made no claim to inspiration*. There is no evidence, external or internal, that they are of

* Watson's Theo. Dictionary.

God. They contain absurd fables, and contradict themselves, and the inspired writings. The prophetic spirit had departed from the Church with Malachi, and appeared no more till the "Lord suddenly came to his temple, the messenger of the covenant." The Great Teacher never recognized them as of divine authority, or of any authority, as a rule of faith; he never quoted them, or even alluded to them. The law of Moses, the Psalms, the book of Job, and the Prophets, all received his divine sanction as the inspired will of God. The Apostles who spake and wrote as the Holy Ghost gave them utterance, quoted from the Law, the Psalms, the Prophets, but never from the Apocryphal books. Josephus gives us a very specific account of the canon of Scripture, as recognized by the Jews in his day, and the books of the Apocrypha are rejected. The voice of the Church for several hundred years, through her wisest, best ministers, and her Councils, was against the admission of those books into the sacred canon. And never were they received as of any authority in matters of faith, by any church or people, till the *infallible* Council of Trent, against the views and remonstrances of some of the ablest divines of that day, voted them to be equal to the Law and the Prophets. That vote stamped them with inspiration, and henceforth they are a part of the Scriptures, and, with *tradition*, a rule of faith! But I may add, in language similar to that used by the great Italian Philosopher, when Rome, through the Inquisition, made him declare the truth of science to be a lie, it is not the will of God notwithstanding.

But why, it may be asked, as millions of souls will

ask, and as the Judge of all, I believe, will ask, why decree those books to be a part of Scripture? It answers a purpose. Some *cherished doctrines, exorcism,* priestly absolution and purgatory*, receive, it is supposed, some sanction from them; may be indirectly proved, at least, by much torturing!

And why, it may be further asked, and the question is significant, why were some of the Apocryphal books rejected by the Council? The prayer of Manasseh and the third and fourth books of Esdras were left out. Had they not equal claims to inspiration and canonicity? Unquestionably they had; which was just none at all. Those books, and the *Targums*, the *Talmud*, the *Cabala*, and *Josephus*, might have been very conveniently taken in, and quite as righteously too! And then the curse, denounced against all those who "shall add unto," or "shall take away from" the *inspired Word*, would no more certainly have fallen upon them, and upon their Church!

The conclusion, then, is inevitable,—indeed, I cannot see how moral reasoning could be stronger—that *the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament, and all of the New, compose the canon of Scripture*, and that, by consequence, *the Apocryphal books, that have no claim to inspiration, but are in conflict with it; that were not received as canonical by Jesus Christ or his Apostles, nor by Jews or Christians, until voted as such by the Council of Trent in 1546—form no part of it.*

The Scriptures, then, the Old and New Testaments, being a rule of faith, must have been designed by the

* See Tobit. The heart and liver of a fish burnt on the ashes of the perfume, drove a devil into Egypt.

gracious God who vouchsafed them, *for every human being—to be put in every man's hands.* This proposition is so clearly set forth by inspiration itself, so fully sustained by the history of the Church for the first eight centuries, and, withal, so accordant with common sense, that, at first blush, it would seem wholly unnecessary to spend a moment in discussing it. But views, dogmas, have been entertained, and even now prevail with regard to it, as wide apart as the poles, and lines of conduct have been pursued as widely divergent. Protestants believe that the Bible was given for all; for universal distribution among all people and in all languages. Hence, they distribute it gladly among all—send it out without “note or comment” wherever Providence opens a door, in heathen lands, or in despotic Roman Catholic countries. As the Word of God, the source and rule of faith, they believe it will “be a light unto the Gentiles,” and will guide many a troubled spirit, that vain tradition and forms and ceremonies have utterly failed to comfort, unto Him who gives the “weary and heavy laden rest.”

Rome believes that it was given to the Church to be kept by her Priests, by them to be expounded to the people; that no one should presume to receive it “without the annotations of the Church,” and only then under the “license of a Priest,” or with the “consent of a Bishop,” and that even then, he must “*form no opinion*” of its *teachings*, or “*make any interpretations*” “*contrary to the sense which the Church has held and holds, even although he should have the intention of holding these interpretations secret.*” So decreed the Council of Trent; and so “the faithful” must act, or

be shut out from the possibility of salvation. This decree amounts to a prohibition of the circulation, reception and reading of the Bible. It has been so regarded by nearly every Pope since. The license of the Priest and consent of the Bishop may not be obtained. This is the case at this moment in Mexico, Central and South America, and the Roman Catholic countries of Europe. But, obtained, and the Bible in hand, "no opinion must be formed," no "interpretation" conceived "contrary to the sense the Church holds, although the interpretation be secret"! Who, then, will dare to read? If to "form an opinion," if to conceive an "interpretation" even "in the depths of conscience" "contrary to the sense the Church holds," is a crime, then there is but one way to avoid the difficulty: never read at all!

Immediately after the close of the Council of Trent, Pius IV. published, and sent out to the shepherds of the flock, "a catalogue of forbidden books," accompanied with the following apostolic opinion and injunction:

"Experience having proved that the reading of the Holy Scriptures, granted without distinction to everybody, does more harm than good, because of the rashness of men, it will thenceforth depend on the judgment of the bishop, or of the inquisitor, to grant according as he may be advised by the parish priest or confessor, leave to read those books, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those who they know can derive from them nothing prejudicial to faith and piety. That permission ought to be given in writing. Whoever shall not be furnished with it, and who, nevertheless, shall have the presumption to read or to possess the Scriptures, shall not have it in his power to obtain the absolution of his sins (!) if he shall not have previously handed them over to the bishop."

But a few years after, Clement VIII. went a few steps further, if possible. Hear him :

“ It is to be observed that this rule has not conferred on bishops and inquisitors any new powers of granting license to buy, read, or possess the Bible in the vulgar tongue, seeing that hitherto, by the order and usage of the holy (!) and universal Roman Inquisition, *that power had been withdrawn from them—which thing ought to be rigorously observed.*”

Then, the Word of God is bound—is denied the people, seeing “ it does more harm than good ”—“ is prejudicial to faith and piety ” ! A bishop, if his judgment approve, “ according as he may be advised by the parish priest,” had the power by a written license to “ grant to those who ” will read it as an automaton, and “ derive nothing from it prejudicial to faith and piety,” “ leave to buy, read, or possess the Bible ” ! but that “ power ” is “ withdrawn by the holy Roman Inquisition ” ! And what does “ the holy Inquisition ” say ? Listen to Perez del Prado, an Inquisitor-General in Spain : “ Some men have pushed their *audacity* to the *execrable extremity* of asking permission to read the Bible.” This was in 1750.

No less than five bulls, from four Popes, have been sent forth against Bible societies in the last forty years ; one every eight years.* Pius VII. calls them “ the most malignant of inventions, the destruction of the faith, a new kind of tares, an irreparable ruin.” And in a brief issued to one of his bishops who had permitted some of the flock to purchase Bibles of one of the Societies, he says :

* See one in Chap. IV., under the head of Intolerance.

"We have been *overwhelmed with much profound distress*, on being made acquainted with the *dismal project*, such as was never conceived before, of disseminating everywhere the most holy books of the Bible in the new translations made contrary to the Church's salutary regulations."

Leo XII. says:

"Several of our predecessors have made laws for averting this scourge. In our own time, Pius VII., of happy memory, issued two briefs. In those briefs we find testimonies drawn either from Holy Scripture (!) or tradition, to show *how hurtful this invention is to faith and morals!* And we, too, that we may acquit ourselves of our apostolic duty, exhort you to *withdraw your flocks from these deadly pastures!*"

The Bible, the *Word of Life*, "*Devil's Pastures*"!!

Pius the VIII. and Gregory XVI. followed the example of their illustrious predecessors; and urged the bishops "to remove from the hands of the faithful the Bible."

Pius IX. declares that "they are the *enemies of human society* who *circulate the Bible.*" And this was only seven years ago.

In Portugal it is a misdemeanor—a violation of law, a crime, to possess or read the Bible. The punishment is three years imprisonment. In Spain it is a crime to be punished "with death by fire."* In Savoy, the nearest point of which is only "two leagues from Geneva," it is imprisonment "for ten years in the Castle of Pignerol"! In Tuscany, who does not know that it is a crime the penalty of which is loss of estates, and rank, and imprisonment? And in every Roman Catholic country in Europe it is a crime to be punished with fines and imprisonment, or death.

* She has somewhat relented. The Bible is now secretly read.

Nor is this hellish malice directed against the Bible published by Protestants, *as a Protestant Bible*, as Roman Catholics sometimes affirm, but against the Bible itself. The above extracts clearly demonstrate this. But further: some of the Bibles circulated in France and burnt by priests, were published from a translation of the Vulgate, made years and years ago* by Sacy, a Roman Catholic. The Bible, distributed in 1816 in Poland, which called forth the anathemas of Pius VII., was printed from a translation of Wink, a Jesuit of 1599. It is the Bible, then, against which Rome directs her impotent rage. *It is a "deadly pasture," a "school for heretics," a "forest that serves as a refuge for robbers."* The Bible is against Rome, and therefore Rome is against the Bible.

But let us listen to the blessed revealments of Heaven, in reference to the point involved in this singular controversy. What is the voice of that gracious Being, who, in the dispensations of His mercy, has revealed to benighted man His mind, to "bring life and immortality to light"? Has He proclaimed that the Bible is given for the priesthood alone, and by them to be expounded to the people, or for all men—to be put in the hands and engraven on the memory of every man? A clear indication of His will surely ought to decide this question :

"Behold I have taught you statutes." "*Keep, therefore, and do them, for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.*" * * * "Teach them thy sons, and thy sons' sons."*

* Approved at the time by Roman Catholic bishops. † Deut. iv. 5.

"Gather the people together, *men*, and *women*, and *children*, and the *stranger* that is within thy gates, that they may *hear*, and that they may *learn*, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law; and that their *children*, which have not known anything, may hear and learn to fear the Lord your God."*

"And when they shall say unto you, seek unto them that have *familiar spirits*, and unto *wizards that peep* and that *mutt-r*—should not the *people* seek unto their God? *To the law and to the testimony*: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."†

"*Seek ye out of the book of the Lord and read.*"‡

"*Search the Scriptures*; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. * * * For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words."§

Now, this whole passage shows that the promiscuous multitude to whom Jesus spake in the Temple, possessed or had access to and read the writings of Moses. *Jesus commanded them to search his writings.*

"Jesus answered and said unto them," the Sadducees, "*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures.*"|| "Do ye not therefore err," said the Saviour as recorded by Mark, "*because ye know not the Scriptures.*" "Have ye not read in the book of Moses?"

"These were more noble," the Bereans, "than those in Thessalonica, in that they receive the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."¶

Did Paul tell them they were wrong? Did St. Luke, in recording, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, their honest zeal, in searching the Scriptures, rebuke them? Not one word of it. They were right; Paul knew they were right; and St. Luke approves.

* Deut. xxxi. 12.

† Isaiah viii. 19.

‡ Isaiah xxxiv. 16.

§ John v. 39, 46, 47.

|| Matt. xxii. 29.

¶ Acts xvii 11.

The inspired epistles of Paul, Peter and John, were addressed not to priests, but to the churches; "the brethren" at Rome, (where was Peter?) Corinth, Philippi: "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," and to a "lady and her children."* By them they were to be read and *sent to others to be circulated.*

"I charge you, by the Lord, that this epistle be *read* unto *all the holy brethren*," wrote Paul to the Corinthians.

Dr. Clarke, in commenting on this passage, says:—

"There must have been some particular reason for this solemn charge; he certainly had some cause to suspect that the epistle would be suppressed in some way or other, and that the *whole* Church would not be permitted to hear it. There is no doubt that the apostles designed that their epistles should be copied and sent to all the Churches in the vicinity of that to which they were directed."

And in connection with this charge, speaking of the "*mystery of iniquity*," Dr. Clarke very properly adds:

"Whatever may be intended here by the words, '*mystery of iniquity*,' we may safely assert that it is a *mystery of iniquity* to deny the use of the sacred Scriptures to the common people; and that the Church that does so is afraid to come to the light. Nothing can be more preposterous and monstrous than to call people to embrace the doctrines of Christianity, and refuse them the opportunity of consulting the book in which they are contained. Persons who are denied the use of the sacred writings may be *manufactured* into different forms and modes, and be *mechanically* led to believe certain dogmas, and perform certain religious acts; but without the use of the Scriptures they never can be intelligent Christians; they do not search the Scriptures, and therefore they cannot know Him

See 1 Peter, i. 1; 2 John i. 1; See Colossians, iv. 16.

of whom these Scriptures testify. The *mystery of iniquity* contained in this prohibition *works now*, and has worked *long*; but did it work in the apostles' times? Did it work in the Church of Thessalonica? Is it possible that the present *crop* should have been produced from so *remote a seed*? What does that most solemn adjuration of the apostle mean: '*I charge you, by the Lord, that this epistle be read unto ALL the holy brethren*'? Why was such a charge necessary? Why should it be given in so awful a manner? Does it not absolutely imply that there would be attempts made to keep *all* the holy brethren from seeing this epistle? And can we conceive that *less* was referred to in the delivery of this very awful adjuration? This *mystery of iniquity* did work *then* in the Christian Church; even *then* attempts were made to *hide* the Scriptures from the common people. And does not this one consideration serve more to identify the prophecy than anything else? The *mystery of iniquity* continues *still to work*; and with all the pretensions of the Romish Church, the Scriptures are in general withheld from the *people*, or suffered to be read under such *restrictions*, and with such *notes*, as totally subverts the sense of those pages on which this Church endeavors to build her unscriptural pretensions. It is generally allowed that the *Vulgate* version is the most favorable to these pretensions; and yet even that version the rulers of the Church dare not trust in the hands of any of their people, even under their general ecclesiastical restrictions, without their counteracting notes and comments. How strange is this! Surely *truth* has nothing to fear from the *Bible*."

On the other hand, there is not one word, in the Law or the Prophets, in the teachings of Jesus Christ or his Apostles, that can be construed, by any fair rules of exegesis, into the idea, that the Scripture was to be kept by priests from the people. There is not one word against their free circulation in every nation under heaven.

What say the Fathers? Writing to a *lady*, St. Basil affirms:

"If thou knowest how to search in Scripture, for the succors that it offers, thou wilt not have need either of me or of any one."

St. Ambrose says:

"Holy Scripture edifies everybody. *We speak to Christ when we pray; we listen to him when we read the Scriptures.*"

Words that ought to be written with the point of a diamond in pictures of gold, and suspended in the dwelling of every man.

"*The heavenly oracles have been written for the whole human race. Ever husbandmen are in a condition to learn, there, what it is fitting for them to know. The learned and the ignorant, children and women, may equally instruct themselves there.*"

"*It is for the whole people that the Apostles wrote. The laity ought to abound in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.*"*

"Continue to listen at church to the reading of Holy Scripture, and read it over again in your houses."†

"When divine things are what we have to do with, should we bend our necks and submit at once to the opinions of others? Consult, then, the Scriptures. The Holy Ghost intrusted the composition of them expressly to illiterate men, in order that every one, even the least educated, might understand the Word and profit by it. Let none offer me these wretched excuses: I must earn my bread; I must find food for my children. It is not for me to read the Scriptures, but for those who have renounced the world. Poor man! Is it then because thou art too much distracted with a thousand cares that it does not belong to thee to read the Scriptures? But thou hast still more need of this than those who have withdrawn from the world in order to devote all their time to God."

So wrote the eloquent, sincere, holy Chrysostom. Had he written an argument, by prophetic inspiration, against the present views and proscriptive course of Rome, he could not more fully have met her objections and answered her arguments.

* St. Jerome.

† St. Augustine.

Polycarp, Clement of Rome, Origen, St. Bernard, whom Rome delights to honor, and a host of others, the moral heroes of the ages in which they lived, who illumined, as beacon-lights, many centuries of the struggling Church, are all of one mind, touching this question. With one accord they exhort the people to "Search the Scriptures;" "to be well exercised therein, that no part of them be unknown," "and to persevere in nourishing themselves in the Word of God."

Every Council of the Church that alluded to the subject in any way, Nice, Chalcedon, &c., for nine hundred years, urged the circulation of the Scriptures, and the people to possess and read them. In the ninth century the voice of the Church was heard through the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in the following earnest strain:

*"Let young women even love the Holy Scriptures. Let them draw wisdom from the books of Solomon; form themselves to patience by reading the book of Job; and then take up the Holy Gospels, never to quit them again."**

Several of the Popes from the sixth to the tenth century, earnestly advocated the circulation and study of the Scriptures. I say from the sixth; for up to that time the bishop, or humble pastor of Rome, should not be called by that inflated, unscriptural title. They were not Popes. They also advocated, with fervent zeal, the circulation and study of the Inspired Word.

The Bible, then, was given for all.

God himself declares, and the Apostolic Church teaches, that it was given for every creature. It was

* Bungener.

vouchsafed to be known and read of all men; that the wayfaring man, in every clime, might not err in the way that leads up to life immortal. And he who reads and obeys its heavenly pages without priest's or confessor's consent, or bishop's license, humbly trusting in the grace of Him who inspired it, and the light and renewing of the Holy Ghost, "shall come to Zion with songs of everlasting joy upon his head, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

"Yet there were at Trent, and there are still people who are ready to denounce as *new*, the idea that the Bible is for all! It was thought monstrous that Luther should have translated it into the vulgar tongue; what then did Jerome do when he translated it into the Latin? What did Ulphilas, one of the Fathers of Nice, do, when he translated it into the language of the Goths? Why did the venerable Bede say with joy, that in his time Scripture was read in England in five different languages? Why, according to Augustine, is it '*by the wisdom of God*' that Scripture, 'from one sole language in which it was originally, has been multiplied into an infinity of languages and dialects, in order that it may be diffused everywhere?' Wherefore so many ages, so many councils, without the smallest word of blame directed against those daily exhortations, against that infinity of translations, against those efforts to prevent there being a *country*, a *village*, a *house*, without the Bible?"*

It follows, then, the Bible having been given for every man, that it must be translated into the language of all men. How else can they know it as the will of God, the rule of faith, and understand, believe, and obey?

'Even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known

* Bungener's History of the Council of Trent. The most of the quotations from the Fathers I have taken from him.

what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak *into the air*. There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification. Therefore, if I know not the *meaning* of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. Wherefore, let him that speaketh in an *unknown tongue* pray that he may *interpret*. In the Church I had rather speak *five words* with my understanding, than by my voice I might teach others also, than *ten thousand words* in an *unknown tongue*.”*

Thus wrote an inspired Apostle; and thus God has decided this question.

When God, therefore, gave his law to the Hebrews, it was in Hebrew. When Jesus Christ taught, it was in the language of the people whom he taught. When the Evangelists and Apostles wrote, it was in the language that the people understood. When it became necessary that the “law and the prophets” should be known in Greek, they were translated, by learned Jews, into that language. And when the Latin became a prevailing tongue in the Church, the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New, were translated, mostly, by that eminent Father, Jerome, into that language. Hence called Vulgate.† *That, with certain emendations,‡ alterations and improvements, is the translation, the Bible which Rome declares “shall only be authentic!” and which she withholds, as we have seen, from the people, even in Latin, and which she utterly refuses to have translated into the vernacular tongues of the millions of the nations of the earth who are per-*

* 1 Cor. xiv. 7, &c. † *Editio Vulgata*. ‡ See Bungenier, p. 91.

ishing for lack of knowledge. But why, we might ask, have a translation at all? Why not declare the original Hebrew and Greek texts "only authentic"? Why not keep the sacred oracles in the mother tongue of the sainted seers of Palestine, and in the flowing language of the mighty dead of Greece? And if a translation into one language be allowable and right, why not into others? Why not have an English, French, Spanish, German Bible? The motives which were then right and acceptable in the sight of God surely are now; the motives that moved the benevolent heart of the good Jerome to translate the Word of God, then locked up in the dead languages of the Hebrews and Greeks, into the language of the people of his day, are in full force now, and should move us, and ought to move Rome, to give it to all people in their own, their native dialects. This, thank God, Protestants have done, and are doing. And in this, again, they have shown that they are right, and compose the true Church, whose pillar and ground is *the truth*.

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Infallibility.

I SHALL now proceed to examine, in the light of Revelation, some of the doctrines of the Church of Rome; doctrines which have been decreed by her councils-general, or have emanated from her Popes, or, by common consent of the Church, have become settled dogmas in her creed. Are they drawn from and sustained by the Scriptures? If an honest, truthful examination, in answer to this question, demonstrates that they are not, but are in utter antagonism with the Word of God, then, indeed, has she "fallen away,"—is "the Man of Sin"—"the beast."

And first in order, and first in importance, is *Infallibility*. This has never been decreed an article of faith by any Council or Pope; it has always been deemed wholly unnecessary; but it is not the less a settled doctrine of this Church. Popes and bishops, priests and people, have affirmed it, promulgated it, reiterated it, times without number.

"Our Church," says an honored, faithful son of Rome,* by virtue of her *infallibility*, to which she alone has an exclusive title, claims a divine right to regulate the faith of all Christians. This is our *fundamental tenet*, our stronghold; if this

* Thayer, quoted by Ousley.

be solid, the plain consequence is, that every Christian is bound to submit his conscience to her decisions, and to receive her interpretation of Scriptures. And until this, our foundation, be overturned, all attempts to show the usurpations of our Church are extremely ridiculous; but when it is proved we are deceived in this, when this, our stronghold, is once destroyed, then, indeed, all our pretensions fall at once to the ground; then only may the Scriptures be pleaded for as the only rule of faith, and the independency of conscience be established."*

The Roman Catechism, that Bible of Roman Catholic children, says, "*The Church cannot err, either in the faith, or the rule of manners.*"

Gregory XVI., in his encyclical letter of 1832, thus teaches:

"It would be criminal and altogether contrary to the respect due to the laws of the Church, to carp at the discipline which it has established: as it is certain, to use the words of the Council of Trent in their thirteenth session, that the Church has been taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, *that she is under the constant teaching of the Holy Ghost*, it is altogether absurd to moot the idea of a regeneration—as if she could be thought capable of falling."

But where does this infallibility reside? This question has never yet been settled. There are in reference to it, views as wide apart, opinions as radically different, emphatically entertained and put forth by all orders and parties in the Church of Rome, as have ever divided Protestants on any question so vital. So much for the vaunted unity of "the Church." One party affirms, that it *resides* in the *Pope*, and in *him alone*. Hear Lainez in the Council of Trent; Lainez, the general of the Jesuits and successor of Loyola, the pampered friend and mouth-piece of Pius IV.:

* This is the hated higher-law doctrine in naked impudence.

"Each *bishop* is *fallible* ; an *assembly* of *bishops* therefore is *fallible* also,* and if you admit their decisions as *infallible*, you admit, by that of itself, that this infallibility comes from elsewhere—that is to say, *from the Pope*, for he alone is called to confirm its decrees. Did the authority of Councils proceed from the bishops who compose them, how could we give the name of councils-general to those which were never reckoned more than a very small part of the episcopal body? Under Paul III.,† have we not seen the most important questions decided by fewer than fifty bishops? If their decrees have become laws of the Church, it is not, evidently, because fifty bishops have been found of the same opinions, but because the Pope, approving of their opinions, has given them the force of law. In every Council, however numerous, if the Pope be present, it is the Pope alone who pronounces; witness the formula *Approbante concilio* or *Præsente concilio*, employed in this case, according to which it is clear that the Pope begins by pronouncing, and that the part of the bishops is reduced to a simple declaration of adhesion, a declaration which they could not refuse, either individually or as a body."‡

This doctrine was received with marked approbation by a large majority of the Council; the partisans of the Pope. Pius IV., and his court, hailed it secretly, with demonstrations of joy. It was therefore the Pope's and even the Council's *theory* of *infallibility*. It was the doctrine of the *Jesuits* and of the *Ultramontane* party. It is their doctrine now. And they now compose eight-tenths of the Roman Catholic Church. But it was met with keen criticism, and a stern spirit of opposition by

* This is good sense and good logic also.

† The first session of that very council (Trent) under Paul III., there were present three legates, four archbishops, and twenty-two bishops—twenty-nine in all. The second, forty-three prelates, all told. And that was a *general* council.

‡ Quoted by Bungener. See, also, Pallavicini.

the Gallican party, mostly French and German prelates, and by some Spanish bishops.

"The Church, then," they retorted, "is no longer the spouse of Jesus Christ, but a *slave prostituted* to the caprice of a man! This monstrous system, invented scarcely fifty years ago, we must hear supported in full Council! By whom? By an isolated and unknown doctor? No; by a man openly protected by the Pope, openly cried up at Rome as the champion of the Church. The other religious orders, it would appear, have not done enough of mischief, so that a new one" (the Jesuits) "was required, already more famous for its encroachments within, than for its successes without the Church. If ever there were Councils in which the Pope alone pronounced, it was an *abuse* and a *usurpation*. In the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, transcribed at length in the book of the Acts, the preamble runs—'The *apostles*, and *elders*, and *brethren*.' Not only is St. Peter not mentioned, but the decree is drawn up in conformity with the advice of St. James, who spoke the last."*

Is not this a sufficient refutation of *Papal infallibility*? A refutation all the more acceptable because it came from as high, as able, and as honorable members as any in the Council. At any rate, it is good Protestantism. Had the Lutherans been admitted to the Council, they could not have spoken out, in so many words, with more historical truth, and correct Scriptural exegesis.

But what theory did they, the Gallicans and opponents of Lainez and his party, the Ultramontane, advocate? for they firmly held the dogma of infallibility. Why, that councils-general, legally summoned, and legally organized, are infallible. Their views are somewhat confused and contradictory. *That*, as I shall show, in the proper place, was singular demon-

* Sarpi and Pallavicini differ in their details of this controversy.

stration of *their* infallibility. But listen to one of the bishops who, at the opening of the Council, affirmed that it could not err, and yet it seems from other assertions, believed as much of the Pope:

"The time is come when God must speak, and will speak. Were you to remain in *impenitence*," (!) said he to his brethren, "do not go on to imagine that thus you would have it in *your power* to *shut the mouth of God!* Happen what may in that respect, the Holy Ghost will find it easy to open yours, and employ it in his service. * * * * If your hearts are *pure*, so much the better; if they are *not*, still the voice of the Council will not the less be God's voice!"

The Gallican, or, as I may call it, liberal party, warmly advocate this theory to this day, and will have no other. The writings and speeches of their ablest divines and prelates abound with arguments to demonstrate that infallibility resides only in councils-general, and, by consequence, not in the Pope.

Another theory: A party, once very numerous, but now greatly in the minority, if it exist at all, teaches that the *Council* and the *Pope*, the Pope at its head, are infallible; that infallibility can only be predicated of this union. One of this class thus defines their views:

"Infallibility is *not* in the *Pope*, nor is it in a *Council*, in the *whole* of the bishops together, but it is in the majority of the bishops united with their head, the *Pope*."*

"I venture not to cast the smallest doubt on the infallibility of councils-general; all I say is, that it holds this high privilege of its head, to whom the promises were made."†

Another party, (how many are there touching this "*fundamental tenet*" of "the Church," which is a *unit*?)

* Thayer.

† De Maistre.

teaches that infallibility resides in the *whole Church*, the Pope, cardinals, bishops, orders, priests, people. A few able names support this theory. It is kindred to the one last-named.

To avoid the difficulties growing out of these theories—and they all have insuperable ones—*Duperron* advances another. It is neither ingenious, nor escapes the sophistries that environ the question, and withal, is rejected by all parties. Hear him:

“The infallibility presupposed as residing in the Pope, is not meant as implying that he is aided by God’s Spirit in having the necessary illumination for deciding *all* questions, but it consists in this, that all the questions in which he *feels himself sufficiently assisted with the light required for judging them*, he decides, but with respect to others in which he does not feel himself *sufficiently assisted with light*, he remits to the Council.”

The “presupposed” infallibility of the Pope then is *intermittent*! He is infallible and not infallible! In a word, if inspired, he is infallible, but if the divine “illumination” come not, he is an erring man again! This is true certainly; all Protestants will unhesitatingly admit this. Who would not? But what if the Pope should be mistaken?—and say what you will, he is not *inspired*. What if he imagine that he has “the light required for judging,” and it be but the scintillations of a disordered brain, or the false glare of an excited fancy? And the history of the papacy demonstrates that both these suppositions have again and again occurred. Momentous questions of faith, binding the souls of men, and affecting their eternal interests, have been decided without “the light required to

judge" infallibly. The "infallibility presupposed," therefore, in all such cases, did not exist.

But another fatal objection lies against this hypothesis. The Popes have never, I believe, "remitted" questions, "to the Council," believing or acknowledging that they had not "sufficient light" to decide them. Paul IV., and a host of others, maintain directly the reverse. Through form, or to legalize them, they have been "remitted." Duperron, therefore, is unwittingly made to advocate the theory that the Pope only is infallible; an untenable dogma, to escape which his hypothesis was conceived. It merits no further reply. Once more, and finally :

"Infallibility in the spiritual order, and sovereignty in the temporal order, are two perfectly synonymous words. When we say that the Church is infallible, we do not ask any special privilege for it; we only ask that it should enjoy rights common to all possible sovereignties, all of which should necessarily reign as infallible, for all government is absolute; and from the moment that it may be resisted under the pretext of error and injustice, it no longer exists."

This is the theory of *De Maistre*, in his work *Du Pape*. It can certainly meet with but little favor with any party. Why, whoever dreamed before, that temporal sovereigns, resisted or not resisted, are infallible in any proper sense of that term. Do they ever claim it? But if they do, what then is gained? Her most Catholic Majesty of Spain, steeped in corruption as she is, and the quibbling, persecuting, blood-thirsty Emperor of Austria, are as far from it as the Arabian Nights' Entertainment is from being a rule of faith. This

theory, therefore, effectually ignores infallibility. Hence, I shall not allude to it again.

There are then half a dozen theories put forth, and learnedly, zealously advocated, shall I say, by the *infallible*, in reply to the question, where does infallibility reside? How many more have been suggested, and how many more will see the light, who can tell? But, notwithstanding, "*the Church is infallible*"! "*cannot err*," cannot "*be thought capable of falling*"! Oh no! This "*is a fundamental tenet*," "*her foundation*," "*her stronghold*." Very well. Where is it then? where are we to look for it? Is the Pope infallible? No! a multitude, from the very bosom of the Church, reply. Are councils-general infallible? No! a more numerous multitude with startling emphasis reply. Are councils-general and the Pope united, infallible? No! no! respond Popes, Jesuits, Ultramontanists, Gallicans. Does it reside in the whole Church? No! respond the same excited, widely-separated parties, united only in this negation. Where is it then? We are anxious; we are interested to know. *Where is it then?* No response is heard; the oracle is dumb, and will forever be dumb. For the simple reason that one single word forms the only rational, tenable reply that can be given—*it is nowhere!*

But let us examine these theories save the last two somewhat more at length. Does *infallibility*, then, *reside in the Pope?* as taught by Lainez, in the face of the assembled wisdom and might of Roman Catholicism, at Trent; and as boldly affirmed by Paul IV., and a host of others. I unhesitatingly and confidentially take the negative. Here, then, we are at issue.

Logically, the *onus probandi* is with the affirmative. I will not wait, however, for arguments and facts, clear and convincing, to demonstrate the truth of this theory; they will never come: I will, as I think can easily be done, demonstrate the contrary—that the Pope is but a fallible, erring man. I will meet this question fairly and fully; examine it as thoroughly as the brief space allowed for the investigation will permit; aye, sift it to the very bottom. And fortunately for me and for the world, the history of the Popes is before us. What they have believed, said, done, is on record. From hence we snatch our weapons; draw our arguments. Let us then go up this stream, muddy as it is, to its very source; and examine its edgings, shoals, depths and meanderings.

And first of all, the Pope is not infallible in morals.

When Gregory XVI. died, the immediate predecessor of him who now wears the tiara, masses were said throughout the Roman Catholic world for the repose of his soul. What! masses said, prayers uttered, sacrifices offered up for the repose of the soul of him who was infallible! And said and offered, too, by the very priest, and in the presence of the very people, who had called him “holy Father,” and bowed to him as infallible! All this occurred, and in these United States not a dozen years ago. But what could disturb him, “the holy Pope Gregory,” in eternity? *He left behind him two fine daughters*, who now reside in Rome;* though beyond the law of God, he was bound by an oath of celibacy!

* This is well known to travellers who visit Rome

Paul III. made his son a duke,* and his grandsons cardinals, to the great scandal, says a historian, of morals and religion in Italy. Bungener thus speaks of him, and speaks truthfully:

“He expired on the 10th of Nov. 1549, charged with a very heavy load of deeds to be answered for in the eyes of religion and of history. God struck in the quarter where his offences had been greatest. After having trampled under foot all laws, and all the proprieties of life, in his eagerness to load with wealth and honors the children whom he should have blushed to own, it was on hearing of the treason of his grandson Octavius, secretly in league with the emperor, that he felt his end approach. In less than three days he died. Had he in his last moments any *re-awakenings of conscience and signs of piety*? Did the first gleams of eternity, as he approached it, make him see at last in its true light his long course of *trickery with the strong, of violence with the weak, of lies to men and to God*?” * * * * * “In him, we have not to do with striking and isolated crimes; his life exhibits a long tissue of immoralities, that are neither murders nor incests, but for which Roman Catholicism and the popedom remain and will eternally remain in part responsible.”

Now, can even a candid Roman Catholic believe that he was infallible? Did the prelates and priests, and people of his day, in the midst of all his trickery and oppression, ever dream that he could not err? Why, even Pallavicini, who was ever ready with subterfuges and denials, to throw the mantle of charity over his masters, does not intimate that he was pure. “Prince of glorious memory!” he exclaimed, “he showed himself man only in the excess of his affection for his own; in all other respects he merited in the eyes of the Church the name of hero.” Not one word of

* Pallavicini states this without any palliation

infallibility; he knew full well that in him it resided not. "Prince of glorious memory;" the father of illegitimate children! "Man in the excess of his affection for his own;" gave his son a dukedom and his two grandsons cardinals' hats!* "In all other respects he merited the name of hero;" intrigued with Charles V. and Francis I.; made overtures and pledges to each against the other; promised men and means to march against the Protestants; and finally, to appease the wrath of the emperor, who had launched a terrible protest against him,† offered to proclaim him King of England, and to furnish him with troops for the conquest of that kingdom!

His position, we know, was environed with difficulties. The Reformation had swept away kingdoms and provinces from the domain of the Church. Its march was onward. Charles V., though at heart a bigoted Romanist, to give peace to his empire, and stability to his throne, desired and urged upon "his Holiness" to make some concessions to the Protestants. He furthermore demanded that the Pope reform himself, his court, and that bishops be declared such, *jure divino*. To all which Paul was irreconcilably opposed. Francis also demanded some reform at Rome—the Pope's court must have been fearfully corrupt—and the doctrine of divine right. And, besides, Francis and Charles had been engaged in a deadly struggle, and the smothered fire still burnt in their hearts. To openly favor the

* One was fourteen and the other sixteen years old.

† Pallavicini says, "This was a thunder-clap launched by a Jupiter who had the lightning in his hand." Where was the thunder of the Jupiter of the Vatican?—*Bungener*.

latter, was to turn the diplomacy, and perhaps sword of the former, against him. And to espouse the cause of Francis, was to provoke another "thunder-clap" from the "Jupiter who had the lightning in his hands." What was he to do? Promise, as he did, and deceive? Intrigue, advance, retreat? Exhausts the arts of diplomacy, in endless evasions, and then, as he did, threaten the wrath of St. Peter? Why did not *infallibility* clip the Gordian knot and guide him out of this labyrinth? Why? Oh ye advocates of papal infallibility, answer. Had the *pure-minded, heroic, inspired Paul, the apostle*, been there, all these difficulties had vanished as mist before the rising sun; and the charge of double-dealing, of falsehood, would never have stained *his fair fame*.

Clement VII., Paul's immediate predecessor, was environed with similar, or greater difficulties, and was guilty of as much dissimulation and falsehood. The royal conscience of Henry VIII., of England, was troubled to live with Catharine, his lawful queen, who had been the wife of his brother, now deceased.* He asked Clement to divorce him. He promised. Charles V., the brother of Catharine, demurred, with threats of dire ruin to all concerned. Clement promised him in turn that he would not divorce Henry. Then commenced a race of diplomacy unparalleled in the corrupt annals of that Satanic art. Henry pressed his suit, and the Pope lent him one ear, and made him gracious promises. Charles returned again and again to the charge, and the Pope, with agitated nerves, lent him the other ear, and emphatically declared that he never

* He was enamored with one of her maids.

would grant the divorce. The affairs of the emperor having taken an unfavorable turn, as he was pressed by the heroic arms of Francis I., who was backed by the sympathy and good will of Henry, and might be any moment by his sword, Clement granted the desired boon, and sent Cardinal Campeggio to the court of England with the divorce. But suddenly a new evolution changed everything. Charles triumphed in Italy, and said sternly to the Pope, "We are determined to defend the Queen of England against King Henry's injustice." Alarmed, the Pope sent out four messengers with fresh instructions to Campeggio. They were to take different roads, and travel in all haste to overtake him. The plan succeeded; the legate received his master's letters. What now does the Pope say? "In the first place, protract your journey. In the second place, when you reach England, use every endeavor to reconcile the king and queen. In the third place, if you do not succeed, persuade the queen to take the veil. And in the last place, if she refuses, do not pronounce any sentence favorable to the divorce, without a new and express order from me. This is the essential: *Summum et maximum mandatum.*"* The legate obeyed instructions to the letter. Many slow months rolled away ere he reached England. Then, with the divorce in his pocket, nothing was done. Cardinal Wolsey, Henry's minister, was deceived and ruined. Campeggio returned to Rome. Clement, under the powerful *egis* of Charles, finally refused the divorce, and peremptorily summoned Henry to Rome, and in case of failure, condemned him to pay

* Saunders and D'Aubigné.

a fine of 10,000 ducats. The proud Tudor was enraged beyond all bounds; broke with the Pope, and was divorced from Catharine by his parliament.

I have no sympathy with, or word of praise for, England's royal debauchee. Henry was a wretch, a disgrace to his name and race. The Pope was right not to divorce him from the noble Catharine. But why did he promise it? Why enter into negotiation with Henry with the view, with the express understanding, to accommodate him? Why spin out the tangled web for years, and traverse the corrupt labyrinths of diplomacy, which is frequently but another name for deception, and then violate every promise, and damn King Henry for doing, in his own way, what he had promised? Why? Will Lainez, will any advocate of this theory answer, "He was infallible"? No other reply can be given, or everything is lost. Yes, he was infallible in all this; or the doctrine of papal infallibility is indeed a doctrine of men, of seducing spirits, and a blasphemy.

Pope Alexander VI. was a monster of iniquity. Adultery, incest, murder, with him, were familiar crimes, were committed, one is almost ready to think, for pastime. He was more than a counterpart of the hated Caligula. "The spot on earth," says a historian,* "where all iniquity met and overflowed, was the Pontiff's seat. The dissolute entertainments given by the Pope and his son and daughter are such as can neither be described nor thought of. The most impure groves of ancient worship saw not the like." He finally perished miserably by poison, which he had

* D'Aubigné.

prepared with his own hand for one of his wealthy cardinals.

Now, was that body, impure with every vice, loathsome with surfeited corruption, the temple of the Holy Ghost? Was that heart—"the cage of unclean birds," the secret reservoir of every crime—the dwelling-place of the Holy One? Was that mind, that ever effervesced with untamed, demon-like passions, the infallible channel of God's favor and instruction to the Church? But one answer, an affirmative one, must unhesitatingly be given, or, I repeat, all is lost. Yes, "that mind, teeming with so many infamous ideas, had only to wish it, in order to its being put into a condition for sounding the most unfathomable mysteries without a chance of error. That hand, which was so skilled in the management of poisons, it depended only on himself to employ in tracing lines as holy, as venerable, as infallible, as those of a St. Paul or a St. John."* Yes, all this must be affirmed, or papal infallibility is a miserable, absurd heresy. But the affirmation will avail nothing: all intelligent, candid men, will certainly, sooner or later, proclaim that it is an absurd, damning error, I trust, even at Rome itself.

Listen to a voice from the bosom of the Church:

"At a time when courtesans, monsters of licentiousness and wickedness, taking advantage of the public disorders, disposed of all things at Rome, and contrived to place their sons and their lovers on the seat of St. Peter, I most expressly deny that those men were Popes."†

This would sweep away infallibility, and the papacy itself, at a blow. Not Popes? What, then, were they?

* Bungener.

† See Maestri.

They were called by that name, and occupied the so-called chair of St. Peter. They were regarded by the Church then, and have been ever since, in every sense, as *bona fide* Popes. Not to admit it is to destroy another fundamental tenet of "Mother Church."

Pope Liberius was publicly proclaimed, by Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, a liar. Hilary anathematized him for this and other immoralities: "I anathematize a second and a third time, Liberius, the prevaricator."

The Emperor Charles V., through his ambassadors at the Council of Trent, demanded, among other reformatory measures, "That the Pope reform both himself and his court!" This speaks "trumpet-tongued" of the debaucheries and crime of "his Holiness" and the court of the "Holy See"! Charles was no pietist, and hated Luther and the doctrines of regeneration and holiness preached by Protestants.

But it would be almost an endless task to bring in review every corrupt Pope, and the impurity and gross immoralities which stain his history. But few, for the last thousand years, have been even outwardly moral. The graphic sketch of Macaulay does not bring out the picture in all its dark shades. Of the court of these *infallible* Pontiffs, and of them, he says:

"During the generation which preceded the Reformation, that court had been a *scandal* to the Christian name. Its *annals* are *black* with *treason*, *murder*, and *incest*. Even its more respectable members were utterly unfit to be ministers of religion. They were men like Leo X.; men who, with the Latinity of the Augustan age, had acquired its Atheistical and scoffing spirit." * * *

"Their years glided by in a soft dream of sensual and intellectual voluptuousness. Choice cookery, delicious wines, lovely women, hounds, falcons, horses, newly-discovered manuscripts of the classics,

sonnets and burlesque romances in the sweetest Tuscan, just as licentious as a fine sense of the graceful would permit ; plates from the hand of a Benvenuto ; designs for palaces by Michael Angelo ; frescoes by Raphael ; busts, mosaics, and gems just dug up from among the ruins of ancient temples and villas,—*these things were the delight and even the serious business of their lives.*"

Nothing can be more clear, therefore, than that the Popes have not been *infallible in morals*. Fallibility, in common with the bishops, and our fallen race, is stamped upon the acts, the history of their lives.

The Pope is not infallible in doctrines.

I will not stop to inquire here, how a man can be *infallible in faith* and *corrupt in morals*. This doctrine, I know, has been advocated by Roman Catholic teachers in certain quarters. A Priest, it is said, has *two characters* ; a *character as a man*, and a *character as a Priest*. As a *man* he may be *corrupt* ; and yet at the same time, as a *Priest*, be *pure*, and God's minister. This is *Manicheanism*, which, in the fourth century, was condemned by the Church. It is in conflict with the Scriptures and common sense. It is most wicked and absurd. "By their *fruits* ye shall *know them*," taught the *infallible* Teacher. Know what? Their *interior life*, *faith*, *doctrine*. Know whether they be of God, or of Satan.

But let us turn again to the lives of the Popes and examine their doctrines. This shall detain us but a few moments. And the question I wish now to examine is not, have they been drawn from and sustained by the "rule of faith"? but have they been uniformly the same, and always received by the Church.

Pope Marcellus, as stated by Sarpi, was a firm be-

liever in astrology, and consulted the planets as much as the Scriptures.

"Paul III.," says Ranke, "would never open any important meeting of the Sacred College; never would he set out on a journey, without consulting the *constellations*. An alliance with France met with several delays, because he had not found a conformity between the birth of the King and his own."

These views gave no evidence to those around them, of infallibility in matters of faith. Some regretted and deplored them; others laughed at them. Three centuries have hid all that from the eyes of millions; and bright visions of holiness and infallibility fill their minds. Truly

"Distance lends enchantment to the view."

Leo X. was deeply imbued with infidelity. Indeed, a number of able historians have charged him with being a semi-atheist, and the charge has never been refuted.

Innocent III. decreed—decrees of the Popes are not only expressions of their views, or faith, but are received as settled dogmas of the Church—that a marriage of Philip Augustus was "adulterous and null." Afterwards by another solemn decree legitimized the children born of that union.

Clement VII. conferred on Henry VIII. the flattering title of "Defender of the Faith," and subsequently anathematized him and put his kingdom under interdict.

Innocent XII. fully approved Fénelon's "*Maximes des Saints*," "and then, on being solicited by a king, and after two years of resistance, condemned it."

Cardinal Baronius, writing of some of the corruptions of the ninth century, says:

“For one hundred and fifty years together the Popes were rather *apostates* than *apostles*, and they were thrust into the papal chair by the power of *harlots*, and the violence of the princes of Tuscany; they were monsters, men of most base life, most destructive morals, and in every manner most defiled.”

A Romish divine thus boldly speaks:

“Many of the Popes of Rome have *erred*; Marcellus *sacrificed to idols*, Liberius and Felix *were Arians*, Anastasius II. was *deposed for heresy*.”

A Pope deposed for heresy! Two Popes Arians! Liberius, every intelligent Roman Catholic knows, was an Arian for years; he excommunicated Athanasius, the orthodox hero of the Council of Nice, and “author of the Roman Symbol;” and was himself anathematized by a bishop! His doctrines have been condemned by Popes and Councils.

Gregory the Great, in the close of the sixth century, writing to John, Bishop of Constantinople, says:

“Our Lord said to his disciples, Be not ye called *rabbi*, for *one* is your *Master*, and *all ye are brethren*. What, therefore, most dear brother, are *you*, in the terrible examination of the coming Judge, to say, to desire to be called, *not father only, but the general father of the world*. * * * I beg, I entreat, and I beseech, with all possible suavity, that your brotherhood resist all these flatterers who offer you this *name of error*, and that you refuse to be designated by so *foolish* and so *proud* an *appellation*. * * * Restrain yourself from this *name of proud and foolish usurpation*. * * * None of the saints would ever have himself called *universal*. How he must swell with pride who *covets* to be called by this name, which no *true saint* would presume to accept.”

In an address to the Emperor Mauritus, concerning the usurpations of this same bishop, Gregory affirms, that,—

“This brother by a presumption never before known, *contrary to the precepts of the Gospel*, and to the decrees of the canons, usurping a new name, glorying in a new and profane title, which *blasphemy* be far from every *Christian heart*, would be called *universal bishop*; but in this his pride what doth he but show the time of *Antichrist* approaches. * * * * The Church that hath consented to that profane name, hath rushed headlong from its state. * * *
* * To consent to that wicked word universal, is nothing else but to *destroy the faith*.”

But a few years had elapsed ere the bishops of Rome were guilty of assuming “the foolish and proud appellation”—“that profane name,” “that wicked word *universal bishop*,” “which *no true saint* would presume to accept.” Had not “the time of Antichrist approached”—come?

The faith, the doctrine of Gregory, therefore, and that of scores of his successors, are in irreconcilable conflict. If *he was infallible they could not have been*; and if *they were, he was not*. But *all*, according to the theory under review, *were infallible*, and all have been put in the *calendar as saints*!

In a word, history demonstrates beyond all cavil, that one Pope has decreed one thing, and another has nullified it and decreed the contrary.

Popes have authoritatively promulgated certain dogmas, and Councils have vetoed them, and decreed the reverse.

In the momentous concerns of faith, therefore, *infallibility does not reside in the Pope*. In doctrine, when

he turns away from "the law and the testimony," "the sure word of the Lord," to follow the dim, uncertain light of tradition, or "cunningly-devised fables," or pretended illuminations which, alas! has been times without number—*he is as fallible in faith as in morals.*

Another fact, that stands out prominently on the historic page, which, if it do not in itself utterly destroy the theory of Papal infallibility, shrouds it with so much darkness that the most acute mind cannot tell where it is. I allude to the schisms which have so often distracted the Roman Catholic Church, and which have scattered her boasted doctrine of unity to the winds; to the fact that *two, three, and even four* Popes, have frequently claimed, vigorously contended for, even unto blood, and occupied, at the same time, the chair of St. Peter. Each regarded himself as the *true* Pope, and many prelates, and many of "the faithful," regarded each as such. In the fourteenth century "there were several Popes at the same time," says Cardinal Baronius, "for many years two or three together, each having his church, anathematizing the others and their churches, and calling them *devils* and *Antichrist.*" In the fifteenth century there were *three* at one time, *Benedict XII., Gregory XIII., and John XXIII.,* all of whom were *deposed* by the Council of Constance, and the Council then elected Martin V. From the middle of the third to the middle of the fifteenth century, there were TWENTY-FOUR SCHISMS. There were more or less in every century in this long period but one, and in the eleventh there were *five!* Where, then, was infallibility? In the *schismatic Popes,* who for years wore the tiara and swayed the

sceptre over the Church, who offered up the "sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead," and issued bulls to regulate the faith? Who was the schismatic Pope, or Popes? Can any man living tell? Can the infallibility of the present pontiff divine? Was the Pope elected by a Council, or thrust into St. Peter's and upon the Church by the sword of a wicked emperor, any the less schismatic than the Popes deposed, any the more infallible than they? And if infallibility did not reside in the schismatic Popes, where was it while they reigned over the Church? when they were deposed? while the Council was electing another? or when a wicked emperor, or king, foisted one upon the Church? And finally, where is infallibility when death has robbed the Church of the true Pope? According to this theory it has passed away from her, and will not return till a true successor "sitteth in the temple of God;" and consequently, human wisdom is left to itself, in the delicate choice of one in whom this attribute is to reside, and who is to give infallible doctrines to the Church; doctrines that will affect for weal or woe the eternal destiny of untold millions.

Take any view, then, of this question, look at it from any standpoint, and the conclusion forces itself upon the mind, that the *Pope is not infallible*; nay, that the doctrine of *papal infallibility* is not only *false*, but *absurd*. And it is lamentably true that it is an error around which crystallizes a thousand other errors; the parent of other heresies, and corruptions, and untold evils. Well then might the indignant Gallicans in the Council of Trent, who saw at a glance the abyss

into which it would plunge them, exclaim, "The Church then is no longer the *spouse* of *Jesus Christ*, but a *slave prostituted* to the *caprice* of a *man*!"

Next in order, and perhaps in importance, is the theory, *that infallibility resides in councils-general*. This, it will be remembered, is the theory of the Gallicans, who utterly reject the one just refuted. It was once the doctrine of a large portion, if not a majority, of the Roman Catholic Church; but is now held by a comparatively small, but respectable minority: a minority that is constantly diminishing. It will not be necessary, therefore, to detain the reader with an elaborate refutation.

In the first place, there never was, and perhaps never will be, a general Council,—a Council of the whole Church. The Council of Trent, that passed in review, and decreed, and sent forth, with anathemas, all the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome against which Protestants inveighed, and which they rejected, was composed of a very small minority, an *infinitesimal* number of those entitled to seats, and who had been invited by the Pope's brief to attend. Indeed, for months, less than fifty members, of thousands, were present. In the first two sessions less than that number transacted business, and with not more than that number important doctrines were decreed. And at no one time was there a very large attendance.* Whole kingdoms and large Roman Catholic countries were not represented by a single bishop. It was not, therefore, an *ecumenical* or *general* Council. "It became

* Gahan, a Roman Catholic historian, puts the highest number who attended at any one time at 287.

such," it is replied, "by the sole fact of its having been universally approved by the Church." But this changes the whole ground and destroys the theory. If it be necessary for the Church universally to approve, how will that approval be known? then, five members will answer as well as five thousand, for infallibility resides in that approval. The Council is fallible, its decrees fallible without such approval. If, therefore, there have been no councils-general—and I affirm there have not; and say what you will, the Council of Trent was not—this hypothesis is annihilated.

Doctrines—articles of faith—have emanated from, and have been established by papal decree, without the decree or aid of Councils. The *Immaculate Conception* of the Virgin Mary, was decreed an article of faith by Pius IX., on the 10th of December, 1854. This question had agitated the Church for many centuries; parties had been formed for and against it. The Popes themselves had been divided in opinion.* Several Councils had gravely discussed it, sifted, weighed it, but, save the Council of Basle,† could not agree—had reached no conclusion. The Council of Trent was agitated with it for days. The Cordeliers and Jacobins renewed a quarrel that had been fiercely burning at times for four centuries. The legates even were divided! No conclusion was reached, and it was left to fluctuate for three centuries more. *Infallible evidence*, this, of the *infallibility* of the *Council*!

* John XXII. was very hostile to it; Sixtus IV. was very favorable.

† Some Romanists deny that this was a general Council. The Church is divided. It was not.

Now, if Councils are infallible, and they only, this decree is a usurpation and fallible. But the Jesuits and Ultramontanists, a large majority of the Church, who regard it a triumph of their views, receive it as an article of faith, and hence as infallible. And so *must* the Gallicans, or cease to be Romanists. The Church, therefore, is in error, or infallibility does not reside in councils-general.

The argument of Lainez, against this theory, will be remembered: "Each bishop is fallible; an assembly of bishops therefore is fallible also." The position, that "each bishop is fallible," was not denied—has always been admitted. The conclusion, though logically drawn, that "an assembly of bishops therefore is fallible," was denied—and the contrary affirmed. But this denial is illogical, it is absurd. It is to affirm of the whole what cannot be affirmed of the parts. The *particles* of a *cannon ball* are *iron*, the *whole* of it is *gold*! If a bishop is fallible *out of a Council*, he must be *in it*, unless it can be proved that in it he is *inspired*. This, indeed, is claimed in indirect terms, at least by some, but rejected by others. But it is an assumption, as we shall see, utterly groundless. The Bishop of Bitonto, in his sermon at the opening of the Council of Trent, affirmed, that "the voice of the Council is God's voice," that though the bishops "were even to remain impenitent," or "happen what may," he added, "the Holy Ghost will employ your mouths in his services." Is not this most daring blasphemy? "Full of the names of blasphemy," is one mark of the beast. "The voice of impenitent" men "God's voice"! Corrupt men inspired! Did Jehovah ever employ, in a single case, such agents

in giving us the Scriptures? “*Holy men* of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;” *they* were the *only men inspired* to reveal the will of God to man, and they were “moved,” inspired, *individually* and *while alone*, or with other Prophets. If this were not true; if the Scriptures rested upon a foundation like the bishop’s theory of illumination and infallibility; if the Prophets and Apostles had been *impenitent* men, *unholy* men, I must confess, that, with a mind not predisposed to, and that never has been, for a moment, troubled with skepticism, I could but be an Infidel. But, thank God, we have a different, and a sure foundation for the prophecies and the Gospel of the grace of God. The bishop knew, the Council knew, the legates knew, that they were not holy, and not inspired.* The latter, in their opening address, after exhorting the bishops to humiliation and penitence, and to sanctify themselves, affirmed, that “without this, in vain they had invoked the Holy Ghost.” They were right, shall we say? and the bishop wrong. And yet, the voice of each was the voice of God! All were infallible! The exhortation of the legates was in vain. There is abundant evidence that the bishops were the same in the Council as out of it; the same then as before. Had they invoked the Holy Ghost in vain?

The history of Councils, especially of Trent, decides the question of inspiration and infallibility.

The Councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, rejected tradition as of no authority in matters of doctrine, and held the Scripture to be a sufficient, and the

* Pallavicini more than admits that they were not holy; and yet claims for such infallibility!

only rule of faith. The Council of Trent decreed that the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith of itself; and that tradition is of equal force and authority. The Council of Nice condemned Arius; another Council decreed Arianism; and then other Councils condemned that doctrine! The Councils of Nice, Chalcedon, and Constantinople, held that the Bishop of Rome was not the supreme head of the Church. Trent, and many other Councils, have held the reverse. In a word, one Council has decreed one thing, and another has vetoed it, or decreed the contrary. One Council has solemnly promulgated a doctrine, and another has solemnly pronounced it heresy. Now, could all have been inspired? Were all infallible? Imagine, if you can, that Isaiah solemnly announces a doctrine as of the inspiration of God; and Jeremiah condemns it, and teaches quite the contrary. Peter preaches one thing and Paul another, in irreconcilable conflict with it, and John pronounces both heresies. What would the world think? And what would the world think, if a Council of Prophets were to decree that *justification* is by *circumcision*, and a Council of Apostles were to decree that it is by *faith*, and another Council of Apostles were to decree that it is by *baptism*? And each Council proclaims itself to be the oracle of God, that its voice "is God's voice"! Why, to say the least of it, all good men would think that all could not be right, and that some were practising a base imposition, and were guilty of most presumptuous blasphemy and impiety.

Nor is this all. According to Sarpi and Pallavicini, both accredited Roman Catholic historians, the Council of Trent was distracted with internal dissensions, and

was the scene of wily diplomacy, dark intrigue, and angry debates. Hostile opinions struggled for the mastery; drafts of decrees were altered, rewritten, changed again, to suit all parties, and finally passed under solemn protests. Some very important questions, the communion in both kinds to the laity, the divine right of bishops, and the Immaculate Conception, among others, were left undecided, because the "infallible" members could not agree.

The most discordant views were entertained and angrily debated on almost every question that came before the Council. Every means was used, every effort put forth, to harmonize the conflicting elements, and to press the members to unanimity in voting, but without complete success. Once some of them refused to vote; once, some absented themselves; once, one bishop, instead of voting an affirmative, said, "I will obey," and several times respectable minorities voted against the decrees, once as high as *thirty-eight*, and several times they protested!

The Pope had a party, the bishops of Italy; the Emperor had a party, the Spanish and German bishops; the King of France had a party, the French prelates, at the head of whom was the time-serving, treacherous Cardinal of Lorraine. And to complete the dark shades of the picture, and shut out all idea of infallibility, the Pope had a *spy* to watch the opposite factions, and especially the Cardinal of Lorraine, to report to him their every movement, and, if possible, every thought. They kept a watchful eye upon the Pope and his plans, but he triumphed in every contest; by the force of numbers, or by threats, neutralized,

overcome all opposition. What can a minority do in a Roman Catholic country? They must submit, finally, or at least silently acquiesce, or be burned as heretics, or flee the country.

Bungener draws a graphic picture of these scenes, and shows, as clear as language can show, that the Council could not have been inspired and infallible, was, indeed, anything else. He says:

"To the difficulty of drawing up any decree on a subject of this nature," (sin and grace,) "there was added that of veiling the infinite diversity of views that had come to light.* It was not, however, proposed, not at least openly, to get rid of the matter by paying no attention to these. Many, indeed, would have been delighted at this being done.

"It was Cervini, Cardinal of Santa Croce, the second legate who undertook this thorny and bold piece of business. A commission, however few the members, would never have brought it to a close; it was necessary that there should be one man to do it, and that a person who was not to be lightly trifled with. Yet the cardinal showed himself beyond measure kindly and complacent. His sole object, his sole thought, was to bring the matter to a close to everybody's content, or at least so to contrive that there should be no one discontented enough to protest.

"And he succeeded, but not until the close of three fatiguing months and fifty sittings, particular and general. Sarpi asserts that he had seen the minutes of *countless changes* made by the cardinal on the first draft; he shows that the greater number of those modifications tended to substitute *vagueness* for what was *positive*, *obscurity* for *clearness*, and for *contested points ambiguous expressions*, in which the most diverse, nay, the most contradictory opinions, as we shall see, might equally claim the credit of having made the law. We know nothing more deplorably astute than the sixteen chapters of that decree. It presents one of those Herculean labors which we admire in spite of ourselves, not for their intrinsic worth, but in con-

* Page 137 Am. edition. The italicising is mine.

sideration of the pains, the time, the imperturbable patience of which they are the fruit. But here, together with perseverance and art, what incredible audacity! What, pretend that this decree, which has cost you three months' hard labor, and in the arrangement of which you have so often felt your *absolute inability* to decide with precision any of the points to be found in it; this decree in which you have openly made concessions to the opposite opinions, and which, only yesterday, you held yourself quite prepared to modify, here and there erasing or putting in just as you would do with any other piece of writing—this decree, on the arrival of the session, has been read with the usual ceremony, and lo! it is forthwith *inviolable* and *sacred*! It will traverse ages without man, angel, prophet, no, not the Son of God himself, were he to return to this world, having the power to alter a word of it, seeing that would infer a disavowal of the Church, to which, according to you, he himself dictated it. Nothing is more curious than the sincerity with which, by way of compliment to the Council, this tedious operation has been acknowledged, although its very length and laboriousness form, self-evidently, so strong an argument against that very Council's authority. 'It is not to be believed,' says Pallavicini, 'with what care, with what subtlety, with what perseverance, every syllable of it was weighed and discussed, first in the congregations of the divines, who only advised in the matter, and afterwards in that of the Fathers who had the definitive voice.' 'In vain,' says Father Biner, 'would any one charge the Council with having treated subjects superficially. * * * * Long deliberations were often thought necessary before a single word could be added, taken away, or altered'! * * * * What an imprudent apology! When called upon to speak, said Jesus Christ to his apostles, 'take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak.' *This is inspiration: this is infallibility.* Without this we cannot have any conception of it. If you required whole hours, whole days to decide upon a word, who shall guarantee that by prolonging your deliberations a little more you would not at last have decided in favor of some other? You prove to us the matureness of the decrees; but matureness, quite a human thing, necessarily supposes the possibility of a still higher degree of matureness; the moment you make it of any avail in favor of a decree, you acknowledge the

introduction of an element that is *human, variable, fallible*. If not, then would you have it that God, by the medium of your hand, has made those innumerable erasures! These gropings in all directions—shall we say of them that it was the Holy Ghost, who, before dictating his last word to you, led you *dancing about from error to error*? Go, after this, go and declaim against the vagaries of Paganism! Never did Greece, never did Italy, or India, adopt any such monstrous improbability. When the Brahmin ordains anything to be believed, it is at least in the name of decrees which he himself has not made, and whose origin is lost in the night of time; but to command faith, to shut and open heaven, on the strength of a law which may be found in its rough draft with blots and erasures, why, this is an audacity which has never been approached by the very falsest religions.”

Now, to ask if such a body was inspired, and infallible, is to insult common sense. If the blessed revelations of heaven had rested on a foundation like this, would they not long since have been regarded as a stupendous fraud, and been numbered with the things that were? What, then, is this boasted doctrine of infallibility?

And finally, the decrees of Councils, all Roman Catholics know, the advocates of this theory admit, are null and void without the sanction of the Pope. If he were to reject them, they would not be laws of the Church, or articles of faith, and would be binding on no conscience, and as worthless as Chinese paper in the sepulchres of “the faithful.” What, inspired doctrines, infallible articles of faith, worthless, fallible, nothing! without the sanction of whom? the Pope!

Now, I submit to the candid reader, if these facts and arguments do not demonstrate beyond all possibility of doubt, that infallibility does not reside in coun-

cils-general. Why, this theory is so utterly groundless, and environed with so many overwhelming, annihilating difficulties, that the wonder is that it ever found a lodgment in the Church, or that it should have stood for a single day.

The third theory, and the next in order, is that *infallibility resides in the Pope and a Council of a majority of the bishops united*. This hypothesis, doubtless, was forced upon those who have adopted it, not only to avoid the fallacies that form the foundation and the superstructure of papal infallibility and the infallibility of councils-general, but from the fact that each, to some extent, is dependent upon the other; that Councils generally have decreed, and the Popes have sanctioned.

This theory is thus stated by one of its advocates:

"Infallibility is not in the Pope, nor is it in a Council, in the whole of the bishops together, but it is in the majority of the bishops united with their head the Pope." What a precious piece of dogmatism. "*Infallibility is not in the Pope.*" Nay, verily. But I dared not make the assertion till I had planted my feet upon incontestible facts, and fortified my position with unanswerable arguments. "*Nor is it in a Council, in the whole of the bishops together.*" Nay, nay! For "each bishop is fallible; an assembly of bishops, therefore, is fallible also." "*But it is in a majority of bishops united with their head the Pope.*" How much like an oracle! How emphatic! But where is the proof? Naked assertion, in a question so momentous, will not answer. We must have clear demonstration. And it would have saved a deal of trouble and would have

quieted many doubts that will not down, if these dogmatizers had told us by what *law* of *Alchemy*, for it is not by any *moral law*, *two fallibles make an infallible!* I cannot comprehend it, I ask for light.

But this theory rests upon a foundation as groundless as the "baseless fabric of a vision." A Council has not been held in seven hundred years, not in a thousand, perhaps, composed of a "majority of the bishops." The Council of Trent had not as many bishops, at most, as Italy could have sent. And Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland and Ireland, could have sent ten times as many. Why, the "Emerald Isle," herself, had more bishops than this famous Council could boast at its first session. If, therefore, infallibility reside "in a *majority* of the bishops united with their head the Pope," the decrees of Trent, and half a dozen other Councils, are fallible,—the doctrines of mere men. And yet it is well known that all the peculiar doctrines of Rome were reviewed, remodelled, or modified, and dressed up,—loose dogmas were licked into shape, and all received the stamp of infallibility by that Council! But "the bishops united with their head the Pope," were mistaken, the Pope was mistaken, an essential element to make them infallible—"a majority"—was wanting! All are fallible. And all they did is fallible. And all papal decrees are fallible. Another Council must be convoked consisting of an undoubted "majority of the bishops united with their head the Pope," and all the boasted infallible doctrines of this boasted infallible Church must be reconsidered and redecreed, and then, what? Why, they would be fallible still.

Doctrines solemnly decreed by one Council with the Pope at its head, have been changed or repealed by other Councils, and the reverse decreed. In one instance, a provincial Council or synod* condemned the decree of a general Council and Pope, and formed its own views into an article of faith, which has received the sanction of Popes and Councils, and become the doctrine of the Church of Rome. This theory, therefore, is not only groundless, but facts which lie on the very surface of ecclesiastical history, prove that it embodies the glaring fallacy exposed in the one last reviewed, to wit, That Councils and Popes are in eternal antagonism with Councils and Popes. It strikes a death-blow at the very "tenet" it was put forth to establish.

The fourth theory, and the last I propose to examine, is this: "*Infallibility resides in the whole Church.*"

It is wholly unnecessary to detain the reader with a lengthy discussion of this opinion. It is the opinion of a few, able though some of them have been. It is not the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Besides, facts and arguments have just been adduced, abundantly demonstrating that the Pope, that councils-general, that a majority of the bishops united with their head the Pope, are not infallible; and all this, this theory evidently admits. How, then, can infallibility reside in all of them united with the priests and laity, all of whom *individually* are acknowledged to be fallible?

Articles of faith never emanate from, or, are never decreed by, the priests and members—the great body of the Church, but are decreed by Councils, or the Pope,

* In the reign of Charlemagne it condemned Arianism.

and are always accompanied with *anathemas*. The former, therefore, *must* receive them, or throw themselves upon the fearful alternative of the sin of schism, and expose themselves to the bitter, eternal curse of the former, who, in such an extremity, would be sustained by the laws and practice of their Church for the last eight hundred years. To say that *their*, or the Church's reception of, or belief in, doctrines, under such circumstances, makes them infallible, is too absurd to be thought of seriously.

The Roman Catholics in North Carolina, or in these United States, are as respectable, as intelligent, and as moral, as an equal number under like circumstances anywhere throughout the vast domain of that Church. Some of them I know and highly respect. They never imagine, so far as I have been able to learn, that this heavenly attribute resides in them; that their reception of, and belief in, doctrines, stamps them with infallibility. No. All the doctrines that command their faith have been elaborated in Councils, and have received the sanction of "his Holiness," or have been decreed by papal authority. And they must receive them as the infallible doctrines of "Mother Church" with unquestioning submission.

That every Roman Catholic receives, in the deep recesses of his own mental nature, every doctrine that Councils and Popes decree, though they be clothed with anathemas never so many, I do not believe. No, thank God, there wells up from the depths of many a manly heart freedom's song, and under the light of the Holy Ghost, who goes by the priest at the altar, and pours his rays upon benighted consciences, these absurd doc-

trines are rejected, and enfranchised longing spirits reach forth for the pure truth of God. Yes, there may be "seven thousand" in the bosom of Romanism, who, amid the gloom, the night of moral death which surrounds them, have light in themselves, and never "bow the knee to Baal." Their numbers, I trust, are increasing. The Immaculate Conception, though backed by the thunder of the Vatican, has been rejected by some, though at their peril, and has called forth arguments and protests against it. Now, is it fallible till they believe it? Or, is it only infallible with those who do? What is to be done with this difficulty?

And finally: not only did the anathemas which accompanied the decrees of the Council of Trent leave the priests and laity—the Church—no choice openly to receive or reject them, but Pius IV., to crush this theory forever, and sweep from the pale of Romanism private judgment, solemnly decreed that none should pass any opinion upon, nay, not even think his own thoughts about them. Despotism reached its culminating point, and tyranny waived its dark banner in midnight gloom over the last expiring groan of freedom within her realm. Hear him:

"In virtue of the Apostolic authority, we *prohibit all*, whether ecclesiastics of *any* rank whatsoever, or laymen, whatever be the authority with which they are invested, the former under pain of interdiction, the latter under pain of excommunication; *we prohibit all*, in a word, *whosoever they may be*, to make upon these decrees of the Council any commentaries, glosses, annotations, scholia, or INTERPRETATIONS whatsoever.*

* This bull was issued January 26, 1564. Quoted by Bungener.

Now, with this "apostolic" (?) law before his eyes and thundering in his ears, can any one imagine for a single moment that infallibility resides in the whole Church? that her reception of doctrines, or acquiescence in them, constitutes them infallible? As well might he imagine that the *unconscious, unresisting* paper on which the decrees were written, is infallible.

Where, then, does this "fundamental" doctrine reside? where are we to look for it? It is not "in the Pope," it is not "in councils-general," it is not "in the majority of the bishops united with their head the Pope," it is not "in the whole Church." Where is it then?

It remains now to examine this doctrine in the light of Scripture. Does it derive any support from, has it any foundation in, the Word of God? The advocates of these respective theories affirm that it has. But why should *they* appeal to the Bible to prove this or any other doctrine? *It* has no authority, they teach, except what it has derived from the Church, "the depository and mistress of the faith." This is a settled dogma in her creed. Without her sanction, therefore, the Bible has no more authority, in matters of faith, than Don Quixote. To decree a book or writing to be a rule of faith and then prove by it that the Church which so decreed is infallible, and therefore had authority in the premises, is going round the "vicious circle" to perfection. But the Bible, with us, with or without such decree, is supreme authority in all things pertaining to faith, and we gladly go with this question to its infallible teachings.

The first passage appealed to, and the one on which

Roman Catholics mainly rely to prove this doctrine, is, the gracious promise the Saviour made to his disciples in his farewell interview, when he clothed them with authority to go out and disciple all nations :

“ And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth ; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.”*

This is, indeed, a very gracious promise, and one to which the heart of the true disciple ever turns with faith, and joy, and hope. But does it imply, or embrace the promise of *inspiration*, or simply of succor amid persecutions and temptations, and of grace to give success to “teaching,” and labors of love?

If the former ; if Christ promised to be with His disciples to inspire them in teaching all things whatsoever he had commanded, in all times, then all those who thus teach, must be infallible. But if the latter, then, though Christ be with them, and though they are good men, holy men, they are fallible men. That the latter is the correct view of this promise—that it is a promise of aid, of grace, of heavenly wisdom, and love and success, and not of inspiration, I have not a shadow of doubt.

The promise of the Saviour to his disciples on another occasion is of the same import, implies fully as much, and will aid us in arriving at a correct exegesis of this:

* Matthew xxviii. 18-20

"I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven : For *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.*"

If any laymen, women, "two of you" "shall ask" *inspiration* "it shall be done"—given you. And "where two or three" laymen, (this certainly has reference to every member of the Church,) "are gathered together, there" *Christ is "in the midst of them."* Then, they are *inspired* and *infallible*. And if so, they are a *law unto themselves*; they are their own *infallible guides*, and no man, nor Pope, nor Council, dare oppose them, without contravening the law of Christ and infallible authority. In a word, if the promise, "lo, I am with you always," implies inspiration; then, inspiration is implied in the promise, "there am I in the midst of them."

But if this promise implies inspiration, and therefore infallibility, the Church of Rome has been rejected by the Saviour, for he is not with her in that sense. For there is not a prelate, or priest, or layman, in her pale, who can tell whether he is inspired, or where this inspiration resides. Or, can one be inspired, be under the illumination, the "moving" of the Holy Ghost, and not know it? If so, (but it is impossible,) it will not make him infallible or anything else. He that does not know that he is inspired, that "the Spirit of the Lord" is upon him, is as if he were not inspired, and is but a fallible man after all.

Again: Popes and Councils have been against Popes and Councils, as I have shown by undeniable facts; the Church has erred, and therefore could not have been

inspired. Hence, according to Rome's interpretation, Christ has not been with her. She signs her own death-warrant.

Finally, if I were to admit that inspiration is implied in this promise, yet as it is *conditional*, the condition must be complied with to the very letter, or it is made of none effect. "Go ye * * * *teach all nations * * * baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; * * * teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I HAVE COMMANDED YOU ; and lo, I am with you,*" &c. What he "*had commanded*" they were to teach : nothing more, nothing less. *That* was the condition on which the promise rested. In teaching what he "*had commanded,*" therefore, and that only, he would be with them. In the performance of that duty, a duty specific, clear—that could not be misunderstood—the promise, all that is implied in it, was sure. But if they should fail, be recreant to their trust, and teach *new doctrines*—"another Gospel"—"*doctrines of men,*" the promise would be forfeited ; Christ would not be with them. It is scarcely necessary to remark, in support of this view, that the Jews again and again made void the law ; made the promises of God, promises as sure as this, of none effect, by their traditions, and wicked departure from Him. And if a priest, or minister, may now teach anything, any wicked doctrine, and practice it, though decreed by Pope or Council, the Pope and Council being corrupt, and yet claim and realize the presence of Christ, then the immutable One has changed, and a lie becomes the truth of God, and Christ and Belial have coalesced.

Has, then, the Church of Rome taught, does she now

teach, the doctrines the Saviour taught, the pure Gospel? Has she complied to the very letter with the condition of this very gracious promise, teaching the nations to "observe" "whatsoever" He "*had* commanded"? Nay, verily. She does not pretend that she has. Council after Council has decreed *new* doctrines. In the last seven hundred and fifty years, "auricular confession, priestly absolution, indulgences, transubstantiation, purgatory," &c., &c., have all been decreed doctrines of the Church. And then, to throw away the last anchor that kept her from drifting out to sea, and to demonstrate that she has fully "departed from the faith," and will teach the "commandments of men" for the Gospel of Christ, the Council of Trent decreed that His commands, in themselves, are not a sufficient rule of faith, that tradition is of equal authority! And but last year Pius IX. decreed the "Immaculate Conception" to be an article of faith! And yet it is claimed that Christ is with this Church! That He is with the "Holy Father" Pio Nino! Well might the apostle exclaim, whose prophetic eye gazed with sorrow upon the working of "the mystery of iniquity" in the Church, and her "departure from the faith," "*For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness*"!

This promise, then, in no sense, sustains the assumed doctrine of infallibility.

The next passage brought forward in support of this doctrine, is in the Gospel recorded by St. John, xvi. ch. 7-13.

“If I depart, I will send Him, the Comforter, unto you. And when He is come, He will reprove the world of sin,” &c. “He will guide you into all truth.”

There are two things contained in this promise; enlightening, convicting grace with which the world was to be and is blessed, and inspiration, which the Apostles only were to enjoy. “He shall guide *you*,” &c. Was the latter to descend down through the Church in all ages? Certainly not. The Church, as we have seen, was to teach what Christ “had commanded.” There was no need, therefore, of inspiration “in all days;” for the doctrines to be taught were revealed, were before her eyes. This the Saviour himself taught in another form: “The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and *bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*” The Apostles were to be inspired to “*remember*” “all things whatsoever he *had said*,” and “all things whatsoever he *had commanded*,” that they might teach and write them in a book, that the Church in all ages might know and obey them. Beyond this it was unnecessary for inspiration to go; and beyond this it did not go, except prophetically. The Apostle fully sustains this exposition: “Though *we*, or any *angel from heaven*, *preach any other Gospel* unto you, than that which *we HAVE preached* unto you, *let him be accursed.*”

No Church, therefore, no man, or body of men, since the close of the Apocalyptic vision, have enjoyed the revealing inspiration of the Holy Ghost. And hence, each and all Churches, and all men, have been fallible. It were hardly necessary to add, that this conclusion

is sustained by all history, ecclesiastical and political.

But one other passage, worthy of any notice, is appealed to in support of this dogma. This is the remarkable language of our Saviour to Peter :

“ And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

I do not now propose to examine this text critically, —this I shall do under the head of the spiritual and temporal supremacy of the Pope. One thing is apparent, however, that this declaration contains no promise of inspiration. Perpetual inspiration, indeed, is not necessary to the perpetuity of the Church : her foundation having been laid upon the Rock : and the sure word of prophecy, and the ever-blessed Gospel of the grace of God, having been given her as a rule of faith, and an unerring, all-sufficient rule of faith, reposing upon that Rock, and implicitly trusting in and fully obeying this that her Founder and Lord has taught, “ The gates of hell shall not prevail against her.” But should she leave this foundation, and build upon the sand, and “ make void the law ” by her tradition, like the doomed Church of Laodicea, she would be rejected and cast forth as the synagogue of Satan. The Jewish Church sinned and fell ; and hence this is not an open question. She left the Lord, “ the fountain of living water,” and “ hewed out ” to herself “ broken cisterns that could hold no water ;” and He who had planted her a living vine, and had blessed and refreshed her with the river whose “ streams make glad the city of God,” overwhelmed her with judgments, suffered her

to be led into captivity, and her priests and young men to be slain. And, let it never be forgotten, that, in her fall and departure from God, and when rejected of Him, she had the same priesthood, the same ritual, the same sacrificial victims, and the same smoking altars; the same ark of the covenant, the same sacred memorials of past divine favor and glorious triumphs, the same burning incense and splendid temple; and the same gracious promises, now hers no more, lived and gleamed amid her buried, forgotten law. And she imagined, with all these, that the divine favor was sure, and that the gates of hell could never prevail against her. Where, then, was the Church? The prophet and "seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal," though scattered and unknown to each other, without a visible head, or priest, or altar, were the Church of God! This passage, then, does not prove the infallibility of the Church of Rome. Nor does it even prove that she cannot "fall away." It simply proves that Christ will always have witnesses on the earth, who, reposing upon Him, the Rock, and "observing all things whatsoever" He "has commanded," "the gates of hell shall never prevail against" them. They are the Church, and she, who glories in the name, having become corrupt, is "Antichrist." No warrant, therefore, is found in Scripture for this doctrine.

Now, I have pursued this dogma through all its windings, have analyzed all its assumed protean forms, and have examined all its boasted foundations, and at every turn and in every position it has been demonstrated to be an insidious, unresting, most pestilential error, groundless and absurd. This "fundamental

tenet," therefore, is but a foundation of eddying sand: this "stronghold" of Rome, a castle infinitely more dim and shadowy than transcendentalism, without cornerstone, or walls, without buttress or tower. "And this," not being "solid," the plain consequence is, that every Christian is *not* "bound to submit his conscience to her decisions," nor "to receive her interpretation of Scripture;" and this her "stronghold" being "destroyed," all "her pretensions fall at once to the ground," and the "Scriptures" may not only be, but are, "pleaded for as the only rule of faith," and "the independency of conscience" established and preserved intact. And God forbid that the day should ever curse this fair land of ours, when this assumed infallible Church of Rome shall take away the one, or lord it over the other!

Auricular Confession.

Auricular Confession was first decreed an article of faith of the Church of Rome, by the fourth Council of Lateran under Innocent III., in 1215. Up to that time it was not a doctrine in her creed, though she boasts that she never changes. It had been a floating dogma for several hundred years, received and practiced by some, but utterly rejected by others; and during the greater part of that time, by a large majority of the Church. It was certainly not, therefore, of apostolic teaching. It was re-examined and redecreed by the Council of Trent. The following is a correct translation of the decree of the Trent Fathers:

"If any one shall *deny* that sacramental confession was instituted or is by divine right necessary to salvation, or shall say that the

mode of *secretly confessing to a priest only is not according to Christ's institutions and command*, and that it is a *human invention*, let him be accursed.

"If any shall say that in the sacrament of penance for the remission of sins, it is not of divine right necessary to confess all and each of such mortal sins which by due and diligent self-examination can be remembered, even *secret sins*, and those, too, that are against the last two commandments of the decalogue, together with their circumstances that might alter the character of the sin; or that shall say that they who study to confess all their sins wish to leave nothing to God's mercy to pardon; or lastly, that it is unfit to confess venial sins, let him be accursed."*

Auricular Confession, then, in the creed of this Church, is absolutely essential to absolution, and absolution to salvation. Hence, there is no way to heaven but through the confessional. And hence, it is the imperative duty of every Roman Catholic and all men to go to the confessional and confess all of his or her sins, in thought, word, act, at short intervals. Even "*secret sins*," all sins, of imagination, of desire, of act, whether done in the blaze of midday, or gloom of midnight,—all must be told to the priest. The delicate young lady must go alone into the room of the priest—a room, every avenue of which is carefully closed, and unbosom her heart to him. Everything must be told, or there is no absolution, no salvation. Yes, everything! And the priest can detain any one as long in the confessional as he deems proper, and ask any and all questions he may choose; and nothing revealed, said, done *there*, must be told out of the confessional upon the pain of eternal damnation. What an illimitable source of power! What a fearful means of corruption!

* Ousley's Translation.

Now, I most distinctly "deny" that "secretly confessing secret sins, or any kind of sins to a priest, was instituted, or is by divine right necessary to salvation," that it "is according to Christ's institution and command;" and affirm "that it is a human invention" and "unfit" for Christian men or women.

Here then, again, we are at issue. The umpire to decide the question, and to which both appeal—the "institution and command of Christ"—is at hand. I gladly take this and all questions of faith and morals, to that, the only rule of faith.

One would imagine, from the emphatic tone and language of this decree, that Jesus Christ most distinctly "instituted and unequivocally commanded" "secret confession" of all our "sins" "to a priest." The Roman Catechism is as emphatic, and teaches the lambs of the flock that—"He has commanded the practice as necessary to salvation." Where, then, is this command? Where this institution? It is not, as will soon appear, in the Gospel, nor in the inspired epistles of the Apostles. There is not a single command touching this question, or duty, in the New Testament. Nor did the doctors of Trent, nor has the Catechism, nor Peter Dens, nor Du Pin, nor Drs. Challoner and Milner, brought forward a single passage, or text which will support this position. The first, and almost the only passage on which they rely, is the language of St. James:

"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be healed."*

* James v. 16.

Now, the Apostle does not mean by the word "*fault*," *sin*—sin against God, but *impropriety, offence* towards a brother. To *him* and *not to a priest*, must we *confess it*, and make the *amende honorable*. This view is sustained by the teaching of the Saviour as recorded by St. Matthew: "If thy brother shall *trespass against thee*, go and tell him his *fault between thee and him alone*. But if he will not hear *thee*, then take with thee *one or two more*. And if he shall neglect to hear *them*, tell it unto the *Church*."*. By the terms "*trespass*," and "*fault*," *sin* cannot be meant; but even if this were so, if the Saviour meant sin, He teaches beyond all cavil that it must be confessed to the one against whom it was committed; and then, to *one or two* more; then, to the Church. Confession of sins, therefore, *secretly*, to a "*priest only*," is not taught by Christ, nor by St. James, in these passages. But not only do these passages not sustain this doctrine, but prove, if they prove anything, that the priest must confess *his faults* to the one against whom he has trespassed, and, in certain cases, to the Church. "*Confess your faults one to another*;" priests and people. But if any have sinned against God, to Him and Him only it must be confessed.

There is no other text brought forward to sustain this doctrine except in connection with absolution, which I shall notice when I come to examine that dogma. Where, then, is the command to confess sin to a priest? When and where did Christ institute confession? The record, the umpire to which Rome has appealed, is silent. Silent! on a subject absolutely essential to salvation! This is a grave, not to say

* Matthew xviii. 15-17.

impious, implication. In everything necessary to salvation the Saviour has revealed himself fully, clearly. In the great commission to the Apostles he specifically lays down their duties; but says not one word about this—does not even intimate that it was His will that they should become confessors, that the people must confess their sins to them. And Paul, in enumerating the duties and prerogatives of an Apostle, bishop, deacon, does not even allude to this; wholly ignores it. And yet the same Apostle declares, that with the Scripture in his hand, “the man of God may be *perfect*,” “*thoroughly furnished unto all good works*.”

Confession was not an article of faith in the early Church; the Church who knew her mission and duty, who drew her life blood, and her inspiration, as it were, from the clear, pure teachings and holy example of the Apostles. Her ministers were not confessors, nor did the holy martyrs confess. Chrysostom unequivocally condemns all secret confessions of sins to priests, or to any one. “Hast thou sinned?” he asked, “thou needest no witness; confess thy sins to God, and he will forgive thee.” And Basil, Hilary, Augustine, with many others, taught that confession must be made only to God. Nor did it become, as we have seen, an article of faith, till, in 1215, it was decreed by the infallible Church of Rome. Now, if it be of “divine institution and command,” and essential to salvation, why did not the infallible Church decree it centuries before? Why did she permit, or wickedly allow so many millions to live in ignorance of their duty, and die without salvation? Why did Paul, and Peter, and John, Polycarp, Chrysostom, and Augustine, never

teach and practice it? but teach the Church, over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, and the world, to confess their sins not to priests, but to God, and Him only? Why? But one answer can be given, "*It is a human invention.*" And the decree and practice of auricular confession demonstrate that the Church of Rome has "fallen away," and gives "heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."

Priestly Absolution.

Intimately connected with auricular confession, and, I may say, kindred to it, is the doctrine of *priestly absolution*. Indeed, confession and absolution may be said to be integral parts of the *sacrament of penance*. And yet they are not this sacrament; it consists in the formula, or words used by the priest in absolving—"Ego te absolvo"—"*I absolve thee.*" So the Councils of Florence and Trent decreed. In the latter Council different opinions were entertained by the doctors and prelates in reference to this very point. Some contended that the sacrament consists in the penitence and confession of the sinner; others contended that it is in the absolution conferred, or given by the priests; others, that it lies in the union of the two; and others, that it is in the words used by the priest in absolving. The last opinion prevailed. A sacrament, we believe, is an outward, visible sign or seal, of an inward work of grace, or of a covenant of grace. The sacrament of baptism consists in the application of water to a proper subject; and of the Lord's Supper, of consecrated bread and wine re-

ceived by devout faith. But the Trent Fathers decreed that the sacrament of penance consists in the words of the priest, "I absolve thee"! And they decreed this in the very face of the third canon—their own work—which anathematizes whosoever shall deny that Jesus Christ established the sacrament of penance by the words: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained"! But that infallible Council could bring together antipodes, make water and oil at a word, coalesce, and bring light out of darkness. But after all, their bungling inconsistencies stand out prominently. However, confession and absolution, if they are not integral parts of the sacrament of penance, as some divines of Rome even now teach, they are indispensable prerequisites of the solemn formula of the priest in which it consists.

Penance, then, has been exalted to the dignity of a sacrament, and that sacrament consists in the words of the priest, "I absolve thee"! Absolution, then, pardon of sins by a priest, is a prominent, settled article of faith in the creed of Rome. Absolution by him is indispensably necessary to pardon and salvation. Hence there is no way to God and to heaven but by and through the priest. The priest is man's *visible saviour*. This conclusion may be gainsayed by some, and denied by others, in certain quarters, but it is an inevitable sequence from these premises—nay, *it is the doctrine of Rome*. Why, in the decree of the Council of Trent, right before our eyes, auricular confession and priestly absolution are affirmed to be of divine institution and command, and the very words the priest is to use, and

by which the penitent is pardoned, are laid down—put into his mouth, which can mean nothing else—“*Ego te absolvo*,” and anathema is thundered against all who shall *deny* that he has divine authority in the premises, and that the penitent is absolved. The Council, if possible, went a step further. In the fourteenth session the following was passed, and now forms a part of the infallible doctrine of this Church:

“Even priests, who are held in *mortal sin*, do exercise, by virtue of the Holy Ghost, conferred in ordination, as Christ’s ministers, the function of *remitting sins*; and that they think ill who contend that there is not this power in *wicked priests*. And though the priest’s absolution is the dispensation of another’s benefit: nevertheless, it is not a naked ministry alone, either of announcing the Gospel, or of declaring that sins are forgiven; but *after the likeness of a judicial act, in which* BY HIMSELF, AS BY A JUDGE, SENTENCE IS PRONOUNCED.”

Thomas Aquinas, Peter Dens, Drs. Challoner and Milner, and a host of others, state and defend this as the doctrine of their Church. The Rev. Dr. Murray, who was born of Roman Catholic parents, baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, and confirmed by a bishop, says, that when a youth he regularly confessed his sins to a priest, and that the priest absolved him. The priest assured him that he was pardoned, and he then believed it, and came out of the confessional satisfied. He had a lighter heart, he assures us, and was ready for amusement and sin again. But it is not necessary to cite decrees of Councils, and quote authors, to prove that the Church of Rome holds this doctrine; it is written on every page of her history for the last six

hundred years, and enters into her daily practice. In a word, she teaches that in the sacrament of penance the sinner only can be pardoned; and that sacrament consists in the absolving words of the priest. Without the priest, therefore, there can be no pardon, no reconciliation with God, no salvation.

The priest, then, deny it as you may, pious or corrupt, a believer or a sceptic, is *man's visible saviour*. Without *him*, heaven is shut, hell is open. And the divinely awakened, agonizing, inquiring penitent, cannot find Him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write; nor can that God who has declared, that "in every nation, he who feareth Him shall be accepted with Him"—accept and pardon the returning prodigal. No! the *visible saviour* must hear his confession and absolve him. "One cannot enter into a place that is shut," says the Roman Catechism, "unless by means of him who has the keys; no more can one enter into heaven, when he has shut the door against himself by a mortal sin, UNLESS THE PRIEST, TO WHOM JESUS CHRIST HAS COMMITTED THE KEYS, SHALL OPEN THE GATE TO HIM." The priest has the keys of heaven! he shuts! he opens! and God, without him, cannot shut, cannot open! "The man of sin," "the son of perdition," was to "sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

Now, is this doctrine, as affirmed by Rome, taught in the Bible? Is this high prerogative, this awful power, of divine "institution and command"? And surely a doctrine, as vital as the atonement itself, would be clearly, fully revealed; revealed on every page in juxtaposition with the love of God, the sacri-

ficial death of Jesus, and faith; the immortal trinity of doctrines, in the union of which there is salvation, and can but be salvation; in the separation of which, though man have all things else, there is death, and can but be death. But this is not the case. Faith, the atonement, the love of God, glow and burn on almost every page of the New Testament, and, like living beacons, pour out their light upon a wicked, benighted world, guiding the penitent to Mount Calvary and to heaven; but absolution of sins by a priest—where is it revealed? There are a few *isolated* passages that *seem* to favor this doctrine; but when they are analyzed in the light of others, when examined in connection with the design and scope of the plan of salvation, and especially in connection with the prescribed duties of the Apostles, the powers with which Jesus clothed them, and with their practice, they do not sustain it. And this is the only proper, safe rule by which to arrive at the meaning, the doctrine of any passage, in any author, or book; especially texts of Scripture.

Blackstone lays down this as the only safe rule in expounding law; and Blair teaches that this rule must be observed to arrive correctly at the views and doctrines of all authors. To eschew this rule; to take an isolated passage and force out of it a doctrine in conflict with its context, and the design and object of the writer—any doctrine may be proved from any author, and the Bible may be made to ignore the being of God himself!

To this rule I shall adhere in this investigation.

The language of the Saviour to his disciples, recorded by St. John, is the first text brought forward

by Romanists to prove the doctrine of priestly absolution: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "How, or to do what work," they ask, "did the Father send the Son?" "To *forgive sins*," they reply. Certainly; this I admit in the fullest acceptation of the terms. But we do not know this except by the context, or His teaching elsewhere. "If, then," they continue, "the Father sent the Son to *forgive sins*, and the Son sent His disciples *as* the Father sent Him; therefore, the Son sent the disciples to *forgive sins*."* But this conclusion is a gratuitous assumption; a miserable fallacy. This is so apparent that an argument to show it, is almost a work of supererogation. The Father sent the Son to *die* to *redeem sinners*. As the Father sent the Son, so the Son sent His disciples; therefore the Son sent the disciples to *die* to *redeem sinners*. This conclusion is as natural and as logical as the other. I insist, therefore, that all Roman Catholic priests be *crucified* to *redeem sinners*! If they claim authority from this passage to forgive sins, for the same reason they must submit to the baptism of blood with which the Saviour was baptized. But a mere tyro in logic, even the unlettered man of common sense, would reject both as wholly gratuitous. What, then, did the Saviour mean by this language? To do what work did He send the disciples? Only what is contained in, and clearly expressed by the great commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature: He that believeth and is

* I heard the late Bishop Reynolds use this very argument. Afterwards, in a friendly conversation with a priest, I pointed out the fallacy, when he roundly affirmed that there was no fallacy in it.

baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”*

How simple! how clear this language! “Go, *preach*,” * * * “*baptize*.” “He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.” Not one word about confession; not one word about priestly absolution. And, with this commission in his hands—with such credentials, what minister could ever imagine that he is clothed with the awful prerogative of absolving penitent sinners?

The next passage brought forward to prove this doctrine, and on which Roman Catholics fully rely, is the 23d verse of the 20th chapter of the Gospel recorded by St. John: “Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” “This language,” it is said, “decides the question.” “By these words,” it is affirmed, “the Saviour instituted the sacrament of penance, and clothed the disciples with power to remit and retain sins.” But did he clothe them with power “to remit and retain sins,” by a word, in their own names, or even in the name of God? or simply to preach the Gospel, which, when received and believed in, would remit sins, or when rejected, would retain them? If the former, the Church of Rome is right—controversy is at an end; but if the latter, then the sacrament of penance has no foundation here, and the priest—I reject that term as without meaning and improper in the Christian Church—the minister has no higher prerogative, can do no more than simply state the terms on which *God will absolve the penitent and save him*. The minister, as the

* Mark xvi. 15, 16.

ambassador of Jesus Christ, preaches His Gospel, which is "a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death;" states the terms on which God will pardon, and hence it is said he remits or retains sins. This exposition is sustained by the whole tenor of Scripture, by the teachings of Jesus Christ, and the practice and teaching of the Apostles.

"O, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if *Thou wilt forgive their sins*; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou has written."*

This was the language of Moses when the children of Israel sinned in making and worshipping the golden calf. Moses, inspired as he was, the governor and leader of Israel's host, the channel of innumerable favors and blessings to them; at the waving of whose wand the first-born of Egypt grew pale in death, and the waters of the Red Sea opened and retired as instinct with life: Moses, who had power to prevail with God—a type of Christ—*could not forgive sins*.

"If you forsake the Lord * * * *He will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins.*"†

In the fervent prayer offered up by Solomon in the dedicatory service of the Temple, we have a number of expressions which fully demonstrate that he and the priests around him, aiding and acquiescing, did not imagine that they, or any one on earth, could forgive sins, but that forgiveness belongeth only unto God.

* Exo. xxxii. 31, 32. See, also, xxxiv. 7.

† Joshua xxiv. 19.

“What prayer or supplication soever be made by any man, or by all thy people Israel, who shall *know every man* the *plague* of his *own heart*, and spread forth his hands towards this house: Then hear thou in heaven thy dwelling-place, and *forgive*, and do, and give to every man according to his ways, whose heart thou knowest, for Thou, even Thou only *knowest the hearts* of all the children of men.”*

Solomon, and the high priest by his side, and the priests around him, knew nothing of auricular confession or priestly absolution.

Amid the deep penitence of the Psalmist, or in his ecstatic joy, he plead with, and looked only to God for forgiveness, or praised him as his only deliverer and Saviour. He went to no earthly priest; was absolved by none:

“Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions. * * * Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.”† “For thou, Lord, art good and ready to forgive.”‡

“I waited patiently for the Lord; and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock and established my goings. And He hath put a new song in my mouth, even praise unto our God; many shall see it, and fear, and shall trust in the Lord.”§

I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions.” ||

The Jews, the priests and the doctors of the law, did not believe, in the days of the sojourn of the Saviour upon earth, that any being could forgive sins, but God only. Hence, when He, who had healed the sick, and

* 1 Kings viii. 38.

§ Psalm xl.

† Psalm li.

‡ Psalm lxxxiv.

|| Isaiah xliii. 25.

raised the dead, and cast out devils, said, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," they were astonished, and asked, "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? Who can *forgive sins* but *God only*?"* They were not astonished at His miracles; Moses and the Prophets had, by the power of God, wrought similar ones; but when He assumed a prerogative belonging only unto God, and which had never been exercised by Priest or Prophet, they were amazed, and charged Him with blasphemy.

"Be ye kind one to another, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you."† "Forgiving one another" "trespass," "faults," improprieties, *as, or because, "God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you"* your sins—sins against Him, which man cannot, which *He only can forgive*.

These and innumerable other passages of the same import in the revealments of Heaven, show that the pardon of "transgression and sin" belongeth only unto God; that He has never delegated this power to Prophet, Priest, or Apostle; and hence, to construe the text under review in the Roman Catholic sense, is to do violence to the harmony of Scriptures. It is to prove, by an isolated passage, a doctrine in conflict with their whole scope and tenor. The Saviour must have meant, therefore, that to the disciples was committed the Gospel of reconciliation—that as His ambassadors they would publish the means and state the terms upon which He would "remit" or "retain" sins. He speaks of what *He himself will do*, through the preaching of the Gospel by his ministers, *as if done by them*.

* Mark ii., 5.

† Eph. iv., 32.

This view is sustained by the whole tenor of the Saviour's teaching. In the four Gospels there is not a single word or passage, except the one under review, and the one of the Keys, that can, by any interpretation that does not do utter violence to all rules of exegesis, be made to sustain, even by implication, the doctrine of priestly absolution. The Saviour reveals himself fully. He communicates to his disciples their duties and responsibilities. He specifically states the work to do which he sends them, to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," or "into all the world." They are to "*preach*," to "*baptize*," to "*heal the sick*;" but to hear "secret confession," and by a word "remit" sins—where is it stated? Where shall we find it? This silence in a matter so momentous, is strangely unaccountable; nay, it demonstrates that in the plan of salvation absolution by a priest has no part. In the duties, responsibilities, authority, prerogatives of the Gospel ministry, as laid down and taught by the great Head of the Church, with the exception of the contested text we are examining and that of the keys, this most sacred duty, this most awful responsibility, has no place. Matthew, Mark and Luke, give us the language of the Saviour when He commissioned the disciples to go to the Jews, and then to all the world, and there is no intimation that they were clothed with this power. The Saviour must be understood, therefore, as speaking of the simple preaching of the Gospel, and not of any power which He had given them, to have in themselves, of remitting sins "*as by a judicial act*."

The *practice* of the Apostles fully sustains this view. The Apostles, all must admit, *understood* the nature and

extent of their commission; the *powers* with which they were clothed. They received it from the *lips* of the *Saviour*. They were *inspired*. They went out and preached, the Holy Ghost bearing them witness with "signs and wonders," and a great multitude was gathered into the fold of Christ. God approved their labors. Their practice, then, decides, or ought to decide, the question—shows clearly and beyond all peradventure what the Saviour meant by this misconstrued and much-abused language: "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted," &c. What, then, was their practice? Did they ever forgive sins? or did they simply preach the means of pardon—Jesus Christ and him crucified, and point the trembling penitent, without "secret" auricular or any "confession" to them, to Him as a sin-pardoning God? Let us see.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter, the first Pope (?) and head of the Roman Catholic Church, papists affirm, Peter, when the multitude cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the *remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.) What a fine opportunity for Peter to have said, "*I absolve thee*"! He dared not do it. He knew that he possessed no such prerogative; that he had been clothed with no such power. A day or two after this, "Peter and John went up together into the Temple." A lame man was healed and the "people ran together." Peter proclaimed to them "the Prince of life," whom they had "killed," as their Saviour. "Repent ye, therefore," he cried, "and be converted, that *your sins may be* BLOTTED OUT, *when the*

times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." And the sins of the multitude were "remitted" or "retained," not by priestly absolution, but through the Gospel: faith in the Gospel, preached by the Apostles, "*when refreshing came from the presence of the Lord.*"

In the sermon preached by Peter, to Cornelius and his company, we have this language: "To him" (to Jesus) "give all the prophets witness, that *through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive the remission of sins.*" "*While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.*"* No priestly absolution here; no solemn announcement, "*I absolve thee.*" Their sins were remitted, through faith in Jesus, while Peter spake. This Peter knew, for they spake "with tongues, and magnified God." And he asked, "can any man forbid water, that these should be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Their sins, then, were not only not "remitted," not blotted out, by Peter, but *before* they were baptized, and therefore *by faith, and faith only.*

When the Philippian jailer fell down convicted and trembling before Paul and Silas, and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" what was their reply? We absolve you; we "remit" all your sins: Jesus Christ, whom we serve, and whose power hath thrown open these prison doors and broken off these stocks, hath given us power to "remit" and "retain" sins? Nay, verily. "They said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." (Acts xvi. 31.) Now,

* Acts x. 43, 44.

is not this fully satisfactory and decisive of the question? Here were inspired Apostles, who knew their duty and the power given to them by the Head of the Church, who dared not "remit" sins. But our modern Apostles know more than they, understand the commission better; and, that the sinner be not troubled to go to Jesus, they absolve him *for money!*

The writings of the Apostles in exposition of the Gospel, and of their Apostolic functions, sustain this view—that to them was simply committed the Gospel which they were to *preach*, and which when *believed* in or *rejected*, would "*remit*" or "*retain*" sins.

The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, discusses, at length, the doctrine of remission of sins, or justification, and reaches the conclusion that it is through the blood of Christ *by faith*, and *faith only*. He first "proves both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin;" (ch. iii. 9,) and that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." (V. 20.) He then declares that we are "justified freely by" "grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;" "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, *through faith in his blood*, to declare his righteousness for the *remission of sins* that are past." (Vs. 24, 25.) "Where is boasting then?" he asks. "It is excluded. By what law? Of works?" By priestly absolution? "Nay; *but by the law of faith.*" "Wherefore we conclude that man is *justified*," *pardoned* "BY FAITH *without the deeds of the law*;" (vs. 27–28,) *without priestly absolution!* In the 4th chapter he takes up the case, or justification of Abraham, to illustrate and corroborate his position. "Abraham *believed* God,

and *it* was counted unto him for righteousness." (V. 3.) "Now to him that *worketh* is the reward not reckoned of *grace*, but of *debt*." The Roman Catholic doctrine of *penance*, or remission, is a *work* throughout; and hence the salvation it procures is not of "*grace*, but of *debt*," and therefore no salvation at all! "Therefore," adds the Apostle, "*it is of faith*," "*that it might be of grace*." (V. 16.) Having fully demonstrated that remission is not by priestly absolution, but by faith only—and argument was never more complete and satisfactory—he breaks out in the commencement of the fifth chapter, in the sweet, triumphant language, "*Therefore, being JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*"!* Oh, that the Roman Catholic penitent could hear this, understand this, believe this!

In his letter to the Galatians, the Apostle declares that "the Scripture, foreseeing that God would *justify* the heathen *through faith*, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham," (ch. iii. v. 8;) and that "the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be *justified by faith*." (V. 24.) And Peter, and James and John, teach the same doctrine. All the Apostles declare that to them was committed a "dispensation of the grace of God to *preach remission of sins through faith in Jesus*." Not one ever claimed the power to "remit" or "retain" sins by an act, or a word; not one ever remitted sins by a word, or pronounced the sinner as absolved in any language, or form, or phrase whatever. They taught the sinner the way of salvation, and pointed the trembling peni-

* The words "justify," "pardon," "remit," mean the same.

tent to Jesus and said, *believe on Him* "and thou shalt be saved." And he who believed lived without priestly absolution.

Now the conclusion is irresistible, that the Apostles had no power to "remit" and "retain" sins as claimed by Roman Catholic priests. The tenor of Scripture, the scope and spirit of the Saviour's teaching, the practice of the Apostles, and their own exposition of their functions, demonstrate this beyond all doubt. The doctrine of priestly absolution, then, as decreed by the Council of Trent and practiced by the Church of Rome, is a "departure from the faith," and a "revelation of the Man of Sin." In assuming it, she has, beyond all question, assumed a prerogative which God has never delegated to man nor Church; and has thus "exalted herself above God." But this doctrine is not only false, it is blasphemous, and fearfully pernicious. It has led astray, from God and heaven, untold millions into the dark mazes of error, and caused them to rest their hopes of salvation upon a foundation of sand; and has finally opened beneath their feet an abyss of woe, at the sight of which "immortality would turn pale"!

The passage of the Keys, on which Rome builds her doctrine of shutting and opening heaven, is of the same import of the one just under review. "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The *Gospel faithfully preached* is the *key* of the kingdom of heaven. It "looses" when *believed* in and *obeyed*; it "*binds*" when *rejected*. The

minister has “the keys of the kingdom,” and power to “bind and loose,” in this sense simply as a preacher. Beyond this he has no power. And if he prove recreant and preach not, God will save through other instrumentalities. He, short-sighted, erring, prejudiced mortal, cannot, as he pleases, by a *word*, *open* and *shut* heaven. No, no! God has never given his ambassadors such power. “To the angel”—the minister—“of the Church in Philadelphia write; these things saith He that is holy, He that is true, *He that hath the key of David, He that openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth.*”^{*} All the benedictions, then, of priests, *per se*, never “loosed” a single soul, and all their anathemas never “bound” one. Rome may bless or curse, and it is all the same. *He that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned!*

An extract from Bungener, in his usual happy, clear style, will show the reader—though I regard the argument as complete—that the priest in absolving, in opening heaven, as he pretends, exalts himself above God, in that he binds God to do what he has pronounced: or else he has really done nothing but pronounce deceptive words which are a blasphemous mockery:

“*I absolve thee*,” he, the priest, has said. Is this declaration *absolute*, or is it *conditional*?

“If *absolute*, if at the instant those words passed from his mouth, they were necessarily ratified in heaven—I say to myself, I may have deceived him with false semblances of repentance, yet those

* Revelation iii. 7. See, also, Isaiah xxii. 22.

words have been not the less pronounced, and God must have ratified a pardon which has been stolen.

"If *conditional*, if God confirms the absolution only in the case of His seeing in me sentiments worthy of grace—this is reasonable; but what becomes of the authority of the priest? He has not really absolved me; he has neither loosed nor bound. All is but a mere promise, that if I fulfil the necessary conditions God will absolve me. May not the first that comes tell me as much? May not I myself say as much to any sinner who may consult me on the state of his soul?

"In the last case, consequently, the priest is only an adviser. He does not absolve you. You are thus compelled, if you hold to leaving him anything to do at all, to return to the other alternative, that is to say, to leave him too much, far too much, enormously too much; you are compelled to admit that once absolved at the confessional, the greatest villain stands absolved before God.

"Read the decree of the Council; is there any indication there that the absolution pronounced by the priest may possibly not be ratified in heaven? No. To say that, in any way, would be to overturn the whole structure. The penitent is, no doubt, told beforehand that he ought not to be silent on any sin, and that he is held bound to perform the penance imposed; but here we find precisely what authorizes him to believe, that after a sincere confession, and the exact performance of the penance imposed, the absolution is necessarily valid. Take hold now of that idea, analyze it, and see to what you are led. A pious woman was asked one day what penalty had been imposed at the confessional, whence she had just returned. Five *Paters* and five *Ave Marias*, she replied. And if you should not say them? My sins will not be forgiven. And if you say them ill, without attention, with weariness and disgust? No more will they be forgiven in that case. Therefore you have not received absolution? Certainly; but I must *work for it*. The priest has not then given you anything? He gave me absolution. Nay, for you still have your sins; and you will continue to have them until your penance be performed, and you will keep them, too, unless you perform it in a proper way. Again we ask, what has the priest given you? Either a *definitive* absolution which you are conscious that you have not received, or a mere *promise* of absolu-

tion, which any other man might have given you. And the poor woman was confounded at seeing no middle point betwixt this reducing of the priest to the level of mere believers, and that exorbitant power with which her conscience forbade her to believe him to be invested."

"They," the Romanists, "will not go so far as to tell you directly, that once absolved by the priest, it matters not how, they believe themselves pure from all sin; but though they say it not, though, strictly speaking, they may not positively think it, that fatal error is not the less the natural, the direct, and, it must be said, the perfectly logical consequence of the system that has been imposed on them. What is confession in those countries into which a little true Christianity, and a little good sense, have not by some means or other penetrated? Did paganism, with its impure priests and cheap expiations, ever present anything so unheard of as the brigand who goes from the confessional to his place of amusements, tasting all the tranquillity of virtue between the crime he has committed, and that which he meditates committing? And why should he not be tranquil? Of his past crimes he is absolved; only let him take care not to be killed before he has murmured a few prayers imposed on him as penance. Of his future crimes he knows he can be acquitted at the same cost. He never dreams of repentance; still less of amendment of life. Shall we be challenged to cite a book, or a priest, that has taught this? True, these are not things that are written or said. But we, in our turn, defy any one to produce a book, or a priest, able enough to refute that brigand so as to deprive him of his frightful security, without a deep breach on the very doctrine of confession, the right of absolution, and all their consequences. Everything, to the very title of sacrament, bestowed on penance, concurs to produce these deplorable results. When the priest has said, 'I baptize thee,' the infant is baptized. When he has said in the mass, 'This is my body,' the wafer is changed, infallibly changed into flesh. When he has said, 'I absolve thee,' how can it be, if *penance* be a *sacrament*, if these words be pronounced with the same authority as the others, how can it be that there should *not be absolution*? To refute the brigand who deems himself absolved, well and duly absolved, you must begin by telling him that *absolution in itself signifies nothing*."

This doctrine was unknown to the Apostolic Church. In the first century there is nothing said about it. The atonement, faith, regeneration, baptism, &c., are themes of earnest discussion, and doctrines of high commendation. But confession, absolution—there is concerning them a profound silence. Who can account for this? Did the Church not know her duty? or was she unfaithful to her Lord, and suffered the holy martyrs to die with mortal sins unremitted, and go down the “sides of the pit”? And when the silence was broken—when “the mystery of iniquity” began to work more and more—it was by Chrysostom, Basil, Hilary, Augustine, &c., against this doctrine. And not till after the Man of Sin exalted himself into the Temple of God, was it practiced to any extent; and it was not an article of faith till the fourth Council of Lateran decreed it in the thirteenth century. The formula used by the few who professed to absolve, from the seventh century to the Council of Lateran, was the more modest, but still very objectionable phrase, “*God absolves thee.*” But then the mystery of iniquity, in this, culminated, and the form was changed to, “*I absolve thee.*”

The difficulties, then, that environ this doctrine and its history, demonstrate no less than the Word of God, that Rome’s interpretation of the passage, “Whose soever sins ye remit,” &c., is erroneous; and that the one I have given is the true one. And this view is sustained, right in the face of the Council of Trent, by Bossuet and Pope Innocent III., incidentally it may be, but that is all the better. “It is Jesus Christ,” says Bossuet, “it is that invisible pontiff who absolves the peni-

tent inwardly, whilst the priest exercises the outward ministry." There are two acts, then, and one may exist without the other. The priest's act is one, and not that of the *invisible pontiff*. Is, then, the priest's absolution such absolutely before, and with, and in the sight of God? No, surely; unless the absolution of the *invisible pontiff* is united with, and controlled by it. But does the visible priest compel the invisible to absolve when he pronounces? None, perhaps, will be so bold as nakedly to affirm this. The priest, then, cannot "remit" sins; the invisible pontiff only can do this. Jesus Christ, therefore, did not institute the sacrament of penance by the words, "Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them," &c. Nor has the priest any more authority than simply to preach the Gospel, and God through the Gospel received by faith, "remits," or when rejected, "retains sins."

"As the Church," says Innocent III., "may sometimes err with respect to persons, it may happen that such an one who shall have been loosed in the eyes of the Church, may be bound before God, and that he whom the Church shall have bound, may be loosed when he shall appear before Him who knoweth all things." I have no doubt of this. Who has? This yields us everything we ask. "Whatsoever is bound on earth," then, by a priest "is not bound in heaven." And Rome's boasted interpretation of this text is erroneous; and all the doctrines built upon it are departures from the faith; and all the consequences flowing out from it, are streams of the mystery of iniquity. To the minister has been committed a dispensation of the

Gospel of the grace of God; he is to preach; here his power begins and terminates—God “binds” or “looses,” “remits” or “retains” sins through his preaching when faithfully performed. He is not a God then; nor a semi-God, but the servant of all. His motto, therefore, should be, “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus’ sake.” And in all his ministrations, he should, must point the sinner to Him and say, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” And he who believes on Him, though the priest were never seen or heard, “shall not perish but have everlasting life.”

Indulgences.

Closely connected with the doctrine of penance, in its nature, is the dogma of *Indulgences*. The Church of Rome claims the power to *remit sins and the punishment due for sins, for a specified time, or even forever*; and this is called an *indulgence*. For a stipulated sum, more or less, the indulgence is *limited* or *plenary*. That Rome claims this power, or that this is an article of faith in her creed, has been questioned by some, and denied by others, in this country; but they might as well deny that the Pope is the head of the Roman Catholic Church, or that he has spiritual sovereignty over his flock. The Council of Trent—supreme authority with papists—says: “Christ has granted to his Church the power of granting *indulgences*,” “and that the use of them is very salutary to the faithful, and must be *retained in the Church*.” According to Sarpi,

there were a few in that Council opposed to it, but with overwhelming numbers they were voted down, and this doctrine "took its place definitely among the Roman dogmas."

Indulgences, in the Roman Catholic sense and use of them, were invented in the eleventh century by Urban II. They were offered as a sure passport to heaven, to all who would take up arms and enter the crusades to the Holy Land. Then, to those who hired a soldier for that purpose. Victor III. granted indulgences to all who would fight against the Saracens. Alexander III. granted them, and an eternal reward, to all who would fight against the Albigenses—those true Christians, and the true Church. Calixtus II., Eugenius, Clement III., all granted indulgences. "John XXII. granted an indulgence for a million of years for devoutly saying *three prayers* written in the chapel of the Holy Cross in Rome"! Pius VII., in a bull, sent to Dr. Moylan, Bishop of Cork, in 1809, uses this language: "By divine providence, Pope, grants unto each and to every one of the faithful of Christ, who, after assisting at least *eight times* at the holy exercise of the mission, (in the new Cathedral of Cork,) shall confess his or her sins with true contrition and approach unto the holy communion—shall visit the said Cathedral Chapel, and there offer up to God for some time pious and fervent prayers for the propagation of the holy Catholic faith, and to our intention, a *plenary indulgence*." Dr. Moylan, in his pastoral letter concerning this dispensation from the Pope, says: "Behold, the *treasures of God's grace* are now open to you! The ministers of Jesus Christ, invested with His authority,

and animated by His Spirit, expect you with a holy impatience, *ready to ease you of that heavy burden of sin under which you have so long labored.** Were your sins as red as scarlet, by the grace of the absolution and application of this plenary indulgence, your souls shall become white as snow." * * * "To gain this plenary indulgence, it is necessary to be truly penitent, to make a good confession," to a priest, of course. "All priests approved of by us to hear confessions can, during the above time, *absolve* all such persons as present themselves with due dispositions at confession, in order to obtain this *plenary indulgence from all sins and censures.*" Now, all this was in this glorious nineteenth century.

It is a well-known fact, that the reformation in Germany commenced in opposition to the sale of indulgences. Pope Leo X. authorized and sent out John Tetzel, a bold, impudent priest, to sell indulgences. Tetzel went forth and offered these "treasures of God's grace" to "the faithful." The letters-patent, given by him, communicating this grace, granting the indulgences and absolution, are full and explicit. Here is one:

"The Lord Jesus Christ have mercy on thee, N— N—, and absolve thee by the merits of His most holy sufferings! And I, in virtue of the apostolic power committed to me, *absolve thee* from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties, that thou mayest have merited; and further, *from all excesses, sins and crimes*, that thou mayest have committed, however great and enormous they may be, and of whatever kind—even though they should be reserved to our Holy Father, the Pope, and to the Apostolic Sec. I efface all the stains of weakness, and all traces of the shame that thou mayest have

* Of what utility, then, had their absolutions been?

drawn upon thyself by such actions. I *remit* the pains thou wouldst have had to endure in purgatory. I receive thee again to the sacraments of the Church. I hereby re-incorporate thee in the communion of the Saints, and restore thee to the innocence and purity of thy baptism; so that, at the moment of death, the gate of the place of torment shall be shut against thee, and the gate of the paradise of joy shall be opened unto thee. And if thou shouldst live long, this grace continueth unchangeable, till the time of thy end.*

“In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“The brother John Tetzel, commissary, hath signed this with his own hand.”†

What a tissue of presumption and blasphemy! Well might the heart of Martin Luther swell with horror and pious indignation at this unholy traffic. He lifted his voice in thunder-tones against it, as a daring assumption of Jehovah's prerogatives, and a fearfully demoralizing, damning sin. At those fearless trumpet-blasts the eyes of the blind were opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped. The Reformation began; and soon the minds of men were liberated from the darkness of ages and priestly bondage, and stood forth “re-generated and disenthralled.”

Dr. Johnson, in his travels in Italy, says:

“That religion cannot offer very formidable checks to immorality, or even crime, which hangs up ‘*Plenary Indulgence*’ on every chapel-door. He who can easily clear the board of his conscience on Sunday, has surely a strong temptation to begin chalking up a fresh score on Monday or Tuesday.”

In Mexico, Central and South America, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Austria, ever and anon, the traveller in

* Wherefore, then, administer extreme unction? † D'Aubigné

his journeyings sees over the doors of Churches, even at this day, this advertisement, "INDULGENCES FOR SALE HERE."

In the "*Christian's Guide to Heaven; a Manual for Catholics*," published some years ago at "Baltimore, with the approbation of the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore," we have the following statement and directions:*

"PLENARY INDULGENCES GRANTED TO THE FAITHFUL THROUGHOUT THESE STATES, AT THE FOLLOWING TIMES :

" I. On Christmas day, and the twelve days following, to the day of Epiphany, inclusively.

" II. In the first week in Lent, beginning with the first Sunday, and ending with the second Sunday, inclusively.

" III. At Easter, *i. e.*, from Palm Sunday, inclusively, to Low Sunday, inclusively.

" IV. From Whitsunday to the end of the octave of Corpus Christi.

" V. On the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, and during the octave.

" VI. On the feast of the assumption of the blessed Virgin Mary, and during the octave.

" VII. On the Sunday preceding the Feast of St. Michael, and during the octave, unless St. Michael fall on a Sunday, in which case it begins on that day.

" VIII. On All Saints' day, and during the octave.

" IX. Once every month, on any day which each of the faithful shall choose, as best suits himself.

" *The conditions of the first, third, sixth, and seventh, are :*

" 1 To confess their sins with a sincere repentance, to a priest approved by the bishop.

" 2. Devoutly and worthily to receive the holy communion.

" 3. To visit some chapel, or oratory, where mass is celebrated, and there offer up their prayers, for the peace and welfare of God's Church."

The fourth and last condition is similar. Then we have the following:

“*Note.*—It is not required, for gaining these indulgences, that these works of mercy, *corporal* or *spiritual*, or this assisting at catechisms or sermons, be done on the same day with the communion; but that persons be then in a disposition, or readiness of mind, to do these things, or some of them at least, when opportunity shall offer.”

Pope Clement XI., in 1718, issued a brief, called the “Bull of the Holy Crusade, to the kingdoms of Spain, and the isles to them pertaining, in favor of all them that should help and serve the King, Philip V., in the war, and expense of it, which he doth make against the enemies of our Catholic faith, with *great indulgences and pardons*.” In this “Bull,” “his holiness doth grant a *free and full indulgence and pardon of all their sins*,” “to all the true Christians,” Roman Catholics, “who shall go to fight against the Turks, and other infidels”—Protestants. On certain days, “the first Sunday in Lent” among others, a “free and full indulgence” is vouchsafed to each and all who will comply with the conditions on which the proffered boon is tendered. “Third Sunday in Lent, free and full indulgence;” and, on “this day, everybody” who has purchased a bull (Clement’s) and obeyed its injunctions, “*takes one soul out of purgatory*”! In fine, “to all those who would take the bull,” and pay for it, of course, “is granted the *same indulgences and pardons, every day, which are granted at Rome*.”—Convenient, very. “The Holy Father,” Clement XI., was very gracious, certainly. But his “merchandise” cost him nothing, and so great and good a favor,—a work so

glorious in its results,—“a free and full indulgence and pardon of all sins,” and the “taking” of so many precious “souls out of purgatory”—he ought to have repeated times without number. How cruel not to have done so! “Pardon,” deliverance “from purgatory,” and heaven offered, oh, infallibly secured, by the purchase and obedience of the brief of a Pope!

Oh, Rome, thou hast, indeed, changed the truth of God into a lie! The simple, pure Gospel, which offers salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, thou hast changed into bulls of Popes, and the blasphemous absolution of priests. Nay, the Pope is God on earth, exalted above Jehovah in the heavens, and his brief, the Gospel.

In a book called “*The Tax of the Sacred Roman Chancery*,”* we have the precise sums to be paid for an indulgence; for the commission of each particular sin, or for the pardon of the sin and remission of the punishment. The vender of these “holy wares,” or the Father confessor, however, may vary the price with the noble and the wealthy. Of him to whom much is given, much is required. I will give but a few cases. I will not blur these pages with the recital of the filthy, corrupt, unholy crimes, and the price of their commission, spread out on the leaves of that work.

For “perjury, forgery, and lying, two dollars.” “Robbery, three dollars.” “Eating meat in Lent, two dollars seventy-five cents.” “A nun for frequent fornication, in or out of the nunnery, five dollars.” “Marrying on a day forbidden, ten dollars.” “Absolution of all sins together, twelve dollars.” “All incests, rapes, adultery, and fornication, committed by a priest, with

* Published by Anthony Egane, a Franciscan friar, in 1673.

his relations, nuns, married women, virgins, and his concubines, with the joint pardon of all his whores at the same time, ten dollars."

Dr. Milner in his "End of Controversy," says:

"The essential guilt and eternal punishment of sin can only be expiated by the precious merits of our Redeemer, Christ; *but a certain temporal punishment God reserves for the penitent himself to endure*, lest the easiness of his pardon should make him careless about falling back into sin!* Hence, satisfaction for his temporal punishment has been instituted by Christ, as a part of the sacrament of penance; and this very satisfaction is only efficacious through Christ. As the promise of the Lord to his Apostles—St. Peter in particular—and their successors, is unlimited: 'Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven;' so the Church believes and teaches, that her jurisdiction extends to this *satisfaction*, so as to be able to *remit it wholly or partially*, in certain circumstances, by what is called an *indulgence*. St. Paul exercised this power in behalf of the incestuous man (2 Cor. xi. 10); and the Church has claimed and exercised the same power ever since the time of the Apostles down to the present. But there must be a just cause for the exercise of it; namely, the greater good of the penitent, or of the faithful, or of Christendom in general, and there must be a certain proportion between the *punishment remitted* and the *good work performed*! Hence, *no one can ever be sure that he has gained the entire benefit of the indulgence, though he has performed all the conditions appointed for this end*! And it is the received doctrine of the Church, that an indulgence, when truly gained, is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an *actual remission, by God himself, of the whole, or of part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight*! This explanation of an indulgence, *conformably to the doctrine of theologians, the decrees of Popes, and the definitions of Councils*, ought to silence the objections and suppress the sarcasms of Protestants on this head."

* Just the reverse is true. The ease with which he gains an indulgence keeps him sinning.

Dr. Milner's great work was written as a special defence of Roman Catholicism, and for the eye of Protestants. This extract, therefore, contains the most reasonable and defensible view which can be presented, of this doctrine. It is a studied effort to explain away the glaring errors that are inherent in it, to keep out of view the fetid stream of corruptions which flows out from it, and to impress the mind that it is of Scriptural origin and apostolic practice. But he signally fails. It is not of divine origin; nor was it ever practiced in the primitive Church. He cites but one single text to sustain him, and that no more proves his assumption than that the Koran is of God. But Mr. Ousley's reply is so much to the point, such a clear refutation, that I give it in preference to anything I might offer :

“That this is the real doctrine of his Council of his infallible Church to this hour, none will dispute ; but that in the whole of it there is a tittle of truth, and that he could believe there is, who of the least information will attempt to affirm ? He assumes as divine truths the following most monstrous propositions : 1. That when God acquits a penitent of *one*—the *eternal guilt*, He still holds him under *another guilt*—the *temporal*. 2. That he himself must endure this latter, and must *atone* for it here, in the way his clergy shall appoint, or in purgatory. 3. That this mode of satisfaction was instituted by Christ. 4. That to his Church He has committed, by an unlimited promise, full power to manage this whole business. 5. That such is her jurisdiction, she can remit the *eternal guilt* in the sacrament of penance, and the *temporal guilt*—the *whole* of it, or a *part* !—by the same, but especially by an *indulgence*, as did St. Paul, and as the Church has ever since always done ! or lastly, by masses ; these two last extending to purgatory also ! 6. Because there must be a just proportion between the punishment remitted and the good work, *i. e.*, the penance enjoined by the pastor ; *no one can ever be sure*, let him perform it ever so well, that

he has gained the *entire of the remission* he aimed at. Hence, of course, his doubts and alarm must *ever* continue, and his Church must devise other new plans for his relief, viz., more penance, more indulgences, a jubilee, extreme unction, and, at the end, purgatory, with more indulgences still, masses, and what not, to extricate the poor soul!!”

That the Church of Rome, then, claims the power to grant indulgences is a settled question. No intelligent person will doubt it; no honest Romanist will deny it.

Now, if penance be a sacrament, and sacraments confer grace, *ex opere operato*, or, from their own intrinsic virtue, or of themselves—so that he who has received the sacrament, whatever it be, must necessarily and without fail, whatever may have been his mental and moral feelings, have received the grace also—as the Council of Trent decreed and “the faithful” believe,—wherefore the necessity of indulgences? If absolution by the priest has remitted sin, the bull of the Pope, or letters-patent, granting indulgences, are a cheat. Or, if a plenary indulgence is necessary to pardon sin, and saves from purgatory, absolution is an impious, ridiculous farce.

This doctrine has no foundation in Scripture. There is not a single passage that even *seems* to favor it. It is emphatically a doctrine of men. Not even does tradition, which Rome claims to be of equal authority with the inspired Word, sustain it. Like the sacrament of penance and the Immaculate Conception, it has been evolved as a necessity of the corruptions of the Man of Sin; and, has been decreed a dogma essential to pardon and redemption from purgatory, to exalt

into divinities the Pope, and prelates, and priests of Rome, and bring the people still more in unquestioning submission and absolute dependence at their feet. Without absolution, and indulgences, and transubstantiation, or mass, what can a poor Roman Catholic do? There is no pardon; no salvation. And *these* cannot be realized without the Pope and the priest. What, then, are the Pope and the priest but divinities before whom the people must bow, and by, and through whom, enter into life eternal? Every mandate of the Pope, of the priest, must be obeyed, every wish gratified, or the channels of grace are turned away, anathema peals its fearful thunders in the darkened heavens, and hell yawns voraciously for its hopeless prey. Beyond all question, proclaim to the contrary as you may, the Hierarchy of Rome is the most unmitigated, relentless, cruel, absolute despotism in the world. A despotism as far from the Christianity taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles; a Christianity which fully recognizes individual, personal rights, the prerogatives of conscience and man's dependence only on God; as far from this, as the darkness of midnight is from the light of noon-day. But more of this in another place.

Many able Roman Catholic authors admit that there is no warrant for this doctrine in the Scriptures; and that it was never practiced in the Apostolic Church. Father Biel says, and the admission has the more force in it because he was an uncompromising advocate of the papacy: "we must confess, that before the time of Gregory, the use of indulgences was very little if at all known, but now the practice of them is grown frequent;" he adds as if fearful the honest confession

would affect "the practice of them": "the Church, without doubt, hath the spirit of Christ her spouse, and therefore erreth not." What a fatal fallacy; a fallacy, as we have seen, which underlies the mighty superstructure of Rome; an empty, airy nothing, a fathomless abyss into which papists plunge when they imagine that they are building on an immovable rock. Here is the great parent error of all the heresies and corruptions of the Church of Rome. In all that she decrees, in all that she believes, in all that she does, she cannot depart from the faith, cannot err. Whatever doctrine or practice, therefore, will strengthen her hands and throw a deeper pall of moral night over the people and forge their chains with stronger links, though at open war with the Scriptures and even tradition, it is decreed and they must believe and obey, or the ever-ready thunders of anathema will scathe, and burn, and kill.

"If we could have any *certainly* concerning the *origin* of *indulgences*, it would help us much in the disquisition of the truth of purgatory; but we have not by writing any authority either of the Holy Scriptures, or ancient doctors, Greek or Latin, who afford us the least knowledge thereof."* St. Anthony, Archbishop of Florence, says—and what a saint says ought to be true—"Touching indulgences, we have nothing expressly cited in Holy Scripture." Cardinal Fisher says, "So long as there was no care about *purgatory*, nobody looked for *indulgences*, for from it proceeds all regard for indulgences. *When purgatory was but so lately known to the Universal Church or received, it is not*

* Cardinal Cajetan. London edition, 1637.

to be wondered at, that in the first time of the Church there were no indulgences."* Cardinal Cajetan, in his tract on Indulgences, commenting on these words of St. Peter, "There shall be false teachers among you, who through covetousness shall with feigned words make merchandise of you," says: "Such are these mercenary preachers, who, for money, abuse the devotion of Christian people, daring to preach from rash ignorance, that those who pay a carlin or a ducat for what they call a *plenary indulgence*, are in the same condition as if they had just been baptized, and that *they even deliver a soul from purgatory*. Such declarations are monstrous, and it is only making *traffic of the people; the Christian religion also condemns it.*"

Yes, verily, "the Christian religion," in genius and spirit, in teaching and practice, does "condemn it" and cast it away as an unholy thing; as one of the "unclean spirits, like a frog which came out of the mouth of the beast."

Finally, Alphonso de Castro, in a work on this subject, admits that "the doctrine of indulgences was quite recent" (this was in the sixteenth century) "in the Church of Rome." "It is the same with this belief," he adds, "as with several others—such as transubstantiation and purgatory; the ancients did not know them, it is true, but what is there astonishing in that, since God daily gives new light to the world?" The same old error of illumination and infallibility. Were it not for this monstrous sophism, which ever haunts, and ever blinds "the faithful," these new doctrines, indulgences, transubstantiation, purgatory, &c.,

* Lutheran Refutation quoted by Ousley.

would be regarded with astonishment, and be rejected as departures from the faith and “doctrines of seducing spirits and of devils.”

Now, can evidence be more clear and convincing—can moral reasoning reach a conclusion more logical and impregnable—that the Church of Rome, in the doctrine of indulgences, has “fallen away;” and is the Man of Sin who came up in the prophetic vision of the Apostle, “opposing and exalting himself above God”? . And yet, in all this, she says she “cannot err.” This “fundamental tenet,” which only could have originated with “the Son of Perdition,” so fills her vision, and illumines with its false glare her heart and her pathway, that she can but see and hold the truth in unrighteousness. Being “incapable of erring,” she can never reform—she can fall away, but return never; and therefore, this foul, damning dogma will form a black chapter in her creed till “the Lord shall consume” her “with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy” her “with the brightness of his coming.”

Transubstantiation.

Transubstantiation, or the conversion of the bread and wine, used for the holy Eucharist, into the body and blood of Christ, by the prayer of a priest, is another fundamental doctrine of the Church of Rome. The bread and wine, she teaches, and most constantly, firmly holds, are not only consecrated to the service of God, set apart from a common to a holy use, as held by Protestants, but are changed, by the prayer of consecration, “into the body and blood, soul and divinity

of Christ." So that Christ is not present *figuratively, spiritually, but really, personally—the bread, under the magic prayer of the priest, has ceased to be bread and is His body; the wine has ceased to be wine and is His blood.* This is a most prominent, distinctive doctrine of Roman Catholics, and their boast and glory. They cling to no dogma, perhaps, with a firmer faith. And it is among the last eradicated from the mind of one seeking the truth, and who is being liberated from the superstition and intolerable burden of oppressive, useless ceremonies of this fallen Church.

As this doctrine should be clearly understood, I will lay before the reader the decree of the Council of Trent. The Trent Fathers say :

"Since Christ our Redeemer, has said, that that was truly his own body which he offered under the appearance of bread; it has therefore been always believed in the Church of God, and is now again declared by this holy Council—That by the consecration of the bread and wine, there is effected a *conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood;* which conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic Church, Transubstantiation.

"If any one shall deny that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, there are contained, *truly, really, and substantially,* the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; or say that he is in it *only as in a sign, or figure, or by his influence,* let him be accursed!

"If any one shall say that in the sacrament of the eucharist, the *substance* of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the *whole substance* of the bread into his body, and the *whole substance* of the wine into his blood, the appearance only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most properly terms Transubstantiation—let him be accursed!"

In the creed of Pius IV., to which all papists subscribe, we have this language :

“ I also believe that in the mass, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice is offered unto God, for the living and the dead ; and that the *body and blood, with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, is truly, really, and substantially, in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, and that there is a conversion made of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood.*”

Dr. Challoner, no mean writer and unimpeachable authority with Romanists, says :

“ After the consecration, *provided there be no defects, there remains nothing of the inward substance of the bread and wine, but the outward appearance only ; and then, Jesus Christ himself, true, God and true man, soul, body, and divinity, who was born of the blessed Virgin, and suffered on the cross, is truly, really, and substantially present in the eucharist ; that the sacrifice of the eucharist is the same as that of the cross, and not two distinct sacrifices, as Jesus never had but one body.*” * * * * “ In the sacrament of the altar, there is every appearance of bread and wine ; yet *neither bread nor wine is there.*”

This language is clear and explicit ; and Rome, for once, desires to be distinctly understood. She here teaches that by the *prayer of a priest, the bread is converted into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood ; that the prayer of consecration, or rather the “ mass,” is a re-offering of Christ, a “ sacrifice,” an atonement for sins, for “ the quick and the dead ;” that the body into which the bread is converted is the very same body which “ was born of the blessed Virgin,” and that was crucified “ on the cross.”*

Let us carefully examine these positions in the light of Scripture and reason :

When the holy eucharist was instituted by the Saviour, he said to his disciples, giving them the bread which he had just consecrated and broken, "Take, eat: this is my body." He took the cup, and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Roman Catholics construe this passage *literally*; and upon this build their doctrine of transubstantiation. Protestants understand it *figuratively*, and hence reject the real personal presence. What, then, did our Lord mean by this language? Did he mean that the *bread* which he blessed and brake and gave to his disciples, which they did eat, was his *living body*, his *flesh* and *blood*, then before them, which lived till next day, was crucified, dead and buried, which rose the third day, and has ascended into the heavens and "is alive forever more"? So Rome teaches, and so papists believe. Or, did he mean that the *bread* was his *body*, *denotatively*, *representatively*, *figuratively*? So Protestants teach, and so we believe. And this, unquestionably, as we shall see, is the Saviour's meaning; this the doctrine taught by him in the Gospel.

1. The Saviour frequently taught in figurative language. "I am the *vine*, ye are the *branches*." "I am the *door*." "I am the *way*." "Ye are the *salt* of the earth;" "the *light* of the world." "My *sheep* hear my voice." "Feed my *sheep*." "Whosoever *drinketh* of the *water* that I shall give him shall never *thirst*; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a *well* of *water* springing up into everlasting life." "The *seven stars* which thou sawest," said the Saviour to John in

Patmos, "*are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches.*" Not literally, really, but figuratively; the stars were not angels, the candlesticks were not churches. They represented them; so the bread and wine represent the body and blood of Christ.

The Saviour used figurative terms, the most rigid papist must admit, in the very institution of this sacrament. "He took the cup, saying, drink ye all of it, * * * this—the cup—is my blood of the *New Testament.*" He blessed the cup—it was his blood—he gave, and they drank it. The cup, therefore, was transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; and the disciple drank it up! But Christ did not mean the cup, but the wine in the cup, you say. How do you know? Did Christ say so? Why, he spoke figuratively. Yes, verily; and the whole passage is figurative. The cup was not the wine in the cup; nor was the wine in the cup, his blood; nor the bread, his body. They were the emblems, or symbolical representations of his body and blood.

2. Christ said to his disciples, and to the Jews, some time before the Supper was instituted, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." Many were offended at this, and said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" As if they had said, "What offensive doctrine is this? We cannot eat his flesh and drink his blood. Immediately, He replied—and the reply was made to correct their literal construction of his language—"What, and if ye

shall see the *Son of Man ascend up*, where he was before?" "You will not eat my flesh *literally*, but *spiritually*." For *this body* will ascend up" "into heaven." He adds, that he may fully satisfy them, and remove all doubt and offence, "It is the *Spirit* that *quickeneth*; THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING: the words that I speak unto you, they are *spirit* and they are *life*."*

That the Saviour intended, by the phrase, "eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood," to be understood in a *figurative*, or *spiritual* sense, as his own exposition clearly shows, is beyond all peradventure. The Fathers, without a solitary exception, so far as I have ever seen, or heard, so understood him. Ignatius, Cyril, Jerome, Chrysostom, Origen, Augustine, &c., and even Bernard, construe this passage spiritually. Augustine says, "Our Lord seems to command an atrocity. It is, therefore, a figure, which is to be understood in a spiritual sense. He is spiritually eaten and drunk. Eat, not with your teeth, but with your heart. Believe, and you have eaten; for to believe and to eat are the same." Origen says, "Christians understand the expression spiritually, and are not *devourers of flesh*." A thousand such expressions might be given. The Fathers were no cannibals.

Mauricius, Ragusa, Villetan, Gerson, Jansenius, Biel, Tilmann, Stephen, Lindan, and a host of others, able writers, and good Roman Catholics; and Lombard, Aquinas, Albert, Bonaventura, &c., subtle schoolmen, and Rome's honored sons; and Cardinals Alliaco, Cusan, Cajetan, &c.; all understood this passage in this

* John vi. 53-63.

sense. Cajetan says, "The Lord speaks of faith." Cusan thus expresses himself, "This language is to be understood, not of visible or sacramental, but of spiritual manducation by faith." Popes Innocent III. and Pius II. concur in this exegesis. Indeed, so far as I can learn, this is the exposition of their Church.

Now, the passage, "This is my body;" "this cup is my blood," is of the same import—must mean the same thing. Or, by what rule of exegesis, by what law of hermeneutics, are we to understand the language, "Except ye eat the *flesh* of the *Son of Man*, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," *spiritually*, and the phrase, "*This is my body—my blood*," *literally*? If the one is literal, so is the other. If the one is spiritual—and the former, Jesus says, the Fathers say, Rome says, is *spiritual*—so is the other. Transubstantiation, then, has no foundation in this passage. Christ's words "are spirit and they are life."

3. St. Paul, in speaking of the consecrated elements, after all the transmuting, or transubstantiating influence that can pass upon them, has taken place, calls them "*bread*" and "*the cup*." "As often as ye eat this *bread*, and drink this *cup*, ye do show the Lord's death." "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of (that) *bread*, and drink of (that) *cup*.*" He must certainly have been ignorant that they had ceased to be "bread" and "the cup," except in "outward appearance only," and that Jesus Christ, his beloved Saviour, "soul, body and divinity," was really, personally,

* The word "*that*," is not clear in the original. It more properly reads, "eat of bread." Of course, he means consecrated bread; but bread still.

present in, and concealed under, them; that they were essentially, properly, truly, "the Christ;" or, learned as he was, inspired as he was, he used language wholly inexpressive of the doctrine he should have inculcated, and only calculated to deceive. No man, to whom he wrote, or in this day, could ever imagine that he meant by "bread," the "body of Christ, which was born of the blessed Virgin, crucified on the cross," and that ascended into heaven. The Apostle's exposition, therefore, shows that the passage under review must be understood in a spiritual sense.

4. "The Lord Jesus, in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, Take eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do *in remembrance* of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, *in remembrance* of me." (1 Cor. xi. 23-25.) Now, here the Apostle teaches, that the consecration of the bread and wine, and the eating and drinking, are all done *in remembrance* of Christ, of his passion and death. But how can they be *in* or *for* a *remembrance* of Christ, when *they are Christ?* as Rome teaches. Can a thing be *in remembrance of itself?* If, as Dr. Challoner says, there is but *one body*, the *bread* after the prayer of the priest, being the same body that was crucified; and if the "sacrifice of the altar is the same as that of the cross," then, it is a *continuation* of the tragic scene of Calvary! and, therefore, not in *remembrance* of his death; *it is his death*. Who is right, St. Paul or Rome?

5. For Christ (in his body) “is not entered into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: Nor yet that he should *offer himself often*, as the high priest,” (under the law,) “entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for there must he *often* have *suffered* since the foundation of the world: but now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to *put away sin* by the *sacrifice* of himself. So Christ was *once offered* to bear the *sins* of many.” * * * *

“This man, (Jesus,) after he had offered *one sacrifice* for *sins*, forever sat down on the right hand of God. By the which we are *sanctified through the offering* of the *body of Jesus Christ once for all*. For by *one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.”* Thus an *inspired* Apostle speaks; thus God teaches. Now listen to Rome: “In the *mass* a *true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice* is offered unto God, for the living and the dead; and that the *body and blood* with the *soul and divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, is *truly, really, and substantially*, in the most holy sacrament of the *eucharist*.” * * * * “The *sacrifice* of the *eucharist* is the same as that of the *cross*, and not *two distinct sacrifices*.” How wide the difference! How palpable and great the heresy of Rome! The Lord declares, that “*Once He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*.” Rome replies, “In the *mass*, a *true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice* is offered unto God, for the *sins of the living and the dead*!” The Lord declares, that “*We are sanctified through the offering of Jesus Christ ONCE for all*.” Rome replies, “The *sacrifice* of the

* Heb. ix. 24 and x. 10-14.

eucharist is the SAME as that of the cross!" Every priest by every prayer of consecration "*sacrifices Christ*" and "offers" Him "unto God for the living and the dead." The Lord declares, that "*Christ*" in the body that was crucified, "*is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.*" Rome replies, "That by the consecration of the bread, there is effected a conversion of the *whole substance* of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord;" that, "then, Jesus Christ himself, true God and true man, soul, body, and divinity, who was born of the blessed Virgin, and suffered on the cross, is truly, really, and substantially present." The Lord declares, that "*the flesh profiteth nothing*; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Rome replies, that the body of Christ is literally, really, truly, present in the sacrament—"flesh," "blood," "bones;" that we literally, really, truly, eat his flesh and drink his blood, and he that believes not this, "let him be accursed!"

6. The literal exposition of the passage under review; that the bread is converted into the body of Christ, truly, really, and that there "remains nothing of its inward substance, but the outward appearance only," is contradicted and refuted by our senses. If "*the inward substance* of the bread" were changed "*into the substance of the body of Christ,*" so that "*Jesus Christ himself, true God and true man,*" were "*truly, really, and substantially present,*" then that "*inward substance*" would look like, taste like, smell like, feel like the "*true,*" "*real,*" "*substantial,*" body of Christ. But Rome replies, "It is a miracle, and therefore his bodily appearance is not cognizable to the senses." But this is a

subterfuge, a sophism so flimsy that it is almost unworthy of the logic of the "Man of Sin." There never was a miracle wrought by Moses, the Prophets or Jesus Christ, but that the "conversion," the change, was cognizable to the senses. When the "rod" in the hand of Moses was cast down and "became a serpent," did it not *look* like a serpent, *smell* like a serpent, *feel* like a serpent? Had it not the *form* and *appearance*, every way of a serpent? It *seemed* so to Moses, for he "fled from before it." "And the Lord said, put forth thy hand and *take it by the tail!* And it became a rod in his hand." (Exodus iv. 3, 4.)

At the marriage in Cana of Galilee, Jesus "converted" water into wine. Was "the *inward substance*" of the water changed into wine, leaving an "*outward appearance*" only? And did not that "*inward substance*" of wine, *look* like wine, *taste* like wine, *smell* like wine? So thought the governor of the feast. He pronounced it "good wine." So thought Jesus; and so thought St. John, who has recorded the miracle. If, then, bread is *miraculously*, or otherwise, "converted into the body of Christ," by the prayer of a priest, so that there "remains nothing of the inward substance of the bread," but the "outward appearance only;" the "inward substance" being "really, substantially, Christ's body," that body must be cognizable to the senses. There is no longer bread, but in "outward appearance only." What then? A miracle has been wrought, and the body of Christ is before us! But it has not the *form*, *size*, *appearance*, *smell*, *taste*, "*substance*," nor *weight* of a body! It answers not to the touch and other senses, as a body, as Jesus did after

his resurrection. *It is not therefore a body, cannot be a body, the body of Christ!* And therefore, if not bread, but in "outward appearance only," *it is nothing!* To such an absurdity is Rome reduced in maintaining a *literal* exegesis of the text, "This is my body."

7. A literal construction of this passage is *philosophically absurd*. A body, the body of Christ, *cannot be in two places at the same time*. A *spiritual, omnipresent* being can be in *two* places at the same moment, because he is *everywhere*. But with a *physical, necessarily local* body, it is different. It must have a local habitation, and *be, or dwell at one place, at a time*; and it cannot be, or dwell at any other place at the same time. The *body* of Christ, therefore, cannot be in heaven, where God says it is, and on a thousand altars in Roman Catholic churches, *created* by priests, at one and the same time. But Rome, to escape from this absurdity, replies, "*It is miraculous:*" "God can make out of bread, by the prayer of a priest, the body of Christ, *whole and entire*, while that body is in heaven." GOD CANNOT DO IT. I speak from the stand-point of reason with which He has endowed us, enlightened by nature and revelation; and I would speak with reverence. What do we know of God, and what God can do, except by the exercise of reason through the light of nature and revelation? What, then, does enlightened reason say? God can create a body out of bread, or out of nothing; but he cannot create, out of bread, *a body that already exists*; nor can he bring into being the same body at different times and widely separate places. God cannot make the *sun*, the *centre* of the solar system, *whole and entire*, and, at the same time,

make *that same sun whole and entire* the centre of some other and remote system. He who would believe and promulgate such an absurdity, would be regarded as exceedingly foolish. And yet, this is the very *kind* of absurdity which Roman Catholics believe and promulgate, and for a denial of which they anathematize Protestants. A priest, however corrupt, by the prayer of consecration, *creates* out of bread, a *body that has existed over eighteen hundred years*, and that *pre-existing body remains* “*whole and entire in heaven*,” and yet, *though nothing but bread is seen*, is “*whole and entire on the altar*”! Verily, if all the bodies created by priests since the Council of Trent, ay, since that of the fourth of Lateran, at which this doctrine was first decreed, were put into one body, it would be larger than St. Peter’s Church at Rome!

The doctrine of Transubstantiation, therefore,—and let the intelligent reader judge of the correctness of the conclusion,—is unscriptural, unreasonable, and absurd. The text, “This is my body,” I repeat it, must, can only be understood figuratively. Christ is present spiritually and partaken of spiritually by faith, and is present, and partaken of, in this sense only.

“But that there is no necessity to understand our Saviour’s words in the sense of Transubstantiation,” says the learned Tillotson,* “I will take the plain concession of a great number of the most learned writers of the Church of Rome in this controversy. Bellarmine, Suarez and Vasquez do acknowledge Scotus, the great schoolman, to have said, ‘that this doctrine cannot be evidently proved from Scripture;’ and Bellarmine grants this not to be improbable; and Suarez and Vasquez acknowledge Hurandus to have said as much.

* Sermons on Transubstantiation. Vol. ii p. 202, London edition.

Ocham, another famous schoolman, says expressly, 'that the doctrine which holds the substance of the bread and wine to remain after consecration, is neither repugnant to reason nor Scripture.' Petrus ab Alliaco, cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, 'that the doctrine of the substance of bread and wine remaining after consecration is more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and no ways repugnant to the authority of Scripture;' nay, more, that for the other doctrine, viz., of Transubstantiation, 'there is no evidence in Scripture.' Gabriel Biel, another great schoolman and divine of their Church, freely declares, 'that as to anything expressed in the canon of the Scriptures, a man may believe that the substance of bread and wine doth remain after consecration.' Cardinal Cajetan confesseth, 'that the Gospel doth nowhere express that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the Church;' nay, he goes further, 'that there is nothing in the Gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, this is my body, in a proper and not in a metaphorical sense; but the Church having understood them in a proper sense, they are to be so explained,' which words in the Roman edition of Cajetan are expunged by order of Pope Pius V.*

In the Council of Trent "a keen dispute arose between the Dominicans and the Franciscans," in reference to the question, How is the Lord's body produced or present in the eucharist. Bungener thus gives their views:

"According to the one, the Saviour's body is made present in the eucharist in the way of *production*, that is to say, without quitting heaven, it is produced in the wafer; according to the others, it is produced by *adduction*, that is to say, it really arrives from heaven to take the place of the substance of the bread. In the former case, consequently, the bread subsists, but it is changed; in the latter, it is annihilated and replaced by another substance.

"It is true, that if the miracle be once admitted, it is by *pro-*

* This was not the first nor the last time Rome has expunged passages from her writers or the Fathers.

duction that one may best try to explain it : but in that case you challenge against the miracle in itself, one of the strongest objections that it can encounter. What becomes of the *identity* and the *unity* of the *body* produced in several different places simultaneously ? This was asked by the Franciscans ; but revenge was taken on their adduction. Nothing in nature, said the Dominicans, is *annihilated*. If the eucharistic bread is not *changed*, but only *replaced*, what, then, becomes of it ? And so both were right and both wrong.”*

The Roman Catechism, to escape the difficulties and absurdities which environ and are inherent in this question, and to unite and settle the faith of all, throws a flood of light, in a single sentence, upon it ! light which, alas ! only makes the darkness more visible. It says, “The bread becoming flesh, and the wine becoming blood, by a *further miracle they preserve their appearance and their taste*” ! How luminous ! how satisfactory !

By a miracle, through the prayer of a priest, the whole substance of the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood, so that bread and wine remain in outward appearance only. The body and Deity of Jesus Christ are there. But simultaneously with this, another miracle is wrought to remove or *annihilate* that body, at least in all the essential qualities and attributes of a corporal being, that bread and wine may *reappear*, and remain in *appearance* and *taste* only. Of what utility, then, was the first miracle ? What end, what good did it accomplish ? Having expired with its birth-throes, and leaving no trace behind it, I am profoundly at a loss to understand the philosophy, or theology of

* They never did agree, and yet were *infallible*.

it. Will infallible Mother Church throw more "light" upon it, that we may take "due notice thereof, and govern ourselves accordingly"? We cannot *believe* such a tissue of nonsense, and yet if we believe it not, —both miracles—everything—we must be damned! No man can be saved, the mother of these inexplicable absurdities teaches, who believes it not. The eternal *anathema sit*, "Let him be accursed," is thundered in his ears, and he is hopelessly damned.

"The business of transubstantiation, therefore," as Dr. Tillotson justly remarks, "is not a controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of reason against reason, but of downright impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and *all the senses and reason of mankind*."

"It is a most self-evident falsehood; and there is no doctrine or proposition in the world that is of itself more evidently true, than transubstantiation is evidently false: and yet if it were possible to be true, it would be the most ill-natured and pernicious truth in the world, because it would suffer nothing else to be true; it is like the Roman Catholic Church, which will needs be the whole Christian Church, and will allow no other society of Christians to be any part of it: so transubstantiation, if it be true at all, it is all truth, and nothing else is true; for it cannot be true, unless our senses, and the senses of all mankind, be deceived about their proper objects; and if this be true and certain, then nothing else can be so; for if we be not certain of what we see, we can be certain of nothing."

This doctrine was not an article of faith in the primitive Church. The Councils of Nice, Ephesus, the first of Constantinople, &c., ignore it altogether. In the Niccan creed, there is no allusion to it. And, until the eighth century, so far as the voice of ecclesiastical history can be understood, it was never thought of; the most rigid literalists, amid all their errors, of this never dreamed. A Council at Constantinople, which

was held in 754, to meet and oppose the tendency to image worship, which was creeping into the Western Church, and was threatening, to say the least of it, to curse her with its senseless, baleful treason, used this language: "Our Lord having left us no other *image* of *himself* but the *sacrament* in which the *substance* of *bread* is the *image* of his *body*, we ought to make no other image of our Lord." Now, could the members of that Council, could the Church up to that time, have known anything about transubstantiation? The second Council of Nice, which met in 787, to establish image worship, says: "That the sacrament is not the *image* and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood." This was the first distinct intimation of this doctrine. This Bellarmine and others admit. Nor did it become a dogma of the Church then. Darkness, and superstition, and corruption had not fully prepared the way for this crowning heresy; this most absurd and wicked novelty. Pas-casius, in the next century, the ninth, preached it. He wrote a treatise in which he clearly stated and emphatically defended the corporal presence. He was the first, it is well known, who openly promulgated it, or seriously wrote about it; and hence he has been called its father. Sermonetus, Bellarmine, and others, acknowledge this. Bellarmine says: "This author was the first who seriously and copiously wrote concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist." What! Christianity over eight hundred years old before any one seriously advocated transubstantiation! And yet, Rome now proclaims that it was instituted by Christ, and has ever been the doctrine of the Church!

The doctrine of Pascasius spread; and soon the Church, which we are told has always been a unit and infallible, was divided in faith, and vacillated from side to side. Many received the new doctrine; but the most pious, able divines, rejected it, and taught that it was heresy. "Raban, Walafrid, Herebald, Prudentius, Florous, Scotus, and Bertram, the ablest theologians of the day, arrayed themselves against the novelty. Raban, Archbishop of Mentz, who was deeply skilled in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, resisted the Pascasian theory with determined hostility."*

"The controversy, for two hundred years after the Pascasian age, seems to have slept. The noisy polemic, on this topic, resigned his pen, and Christendom, entombed in Egyptian darkness, sunk into immorality and superstition. Transubstantiation, in this destitution of literature, continued to gain ground; till, at last, its pestilential breath infected all orders and ranks of men. The dogma, indeed, is calculated for the meridian of superstition. The idea of a *visible* Deity must be ever welcome to an ignorant crowd. The innovation, besides, made no direct or violent attack on the popular prepossessions. The error effected no mutilation of the ancient faith; but an addition, which is calculated to become the idol of superstition. The Pascasian theory superinduced the corporeal on the spiritual presence."

"The controversy was awakened from the sleep of two hundred years, by Berengarius, in the eleventh century. This celebrated character was principal in the school of Tours, and afterwards archdeacon of Angers. He was distinguished, according to Paris, for genius, learning, piety, charity, holiness and humility. Following Bertram and Scotus on the sacrament, he publicly, 1045, opposed Pascasius. Many adopted and many rejected his system. The clergy and the laity, in the ninth century, united, in general, against Pascasianism; but differed, about two hundred years after, about Berengarianism. The controversy was agitated in many verbal and

* Edgar's Variations.

written disputations. Berengarianism, however, according to cotemporary and succeeding historians, was the general faith of England, France, and Italy."

"Berengarianism was denounced, with determined hostility and tremendous anathemas, by the Roman pontiffs. Its author was persecuted by Leo, Victor, Nicholas, and Alexander. He was compelled to sign *three different and conflicting confessions*, in *three Roman Councils*, under Nicholas and Gregory !

"Nicholas, in 1058, convened a Council at the Lateran against Berengarius. This assembly consisted of one hundred and thirteen bishops ; and the patron of the reputed heresy was summoned to attend. He complied, and supported his system with a strength of reason and eloquence which, Sigonius, Leo, and Henry attest, withered all opposition. All shrunk in terror, while the Vatican resounded with the thunder of his oratory. * * * His holiness, in this exigency, sent an express for Alberic, a cardinal-deacon of great erudition, who, it was hoped, could face this fearful champion of error. Alberic, after a warm discussion, solicited a cessation of arms for a week, to employ his pen against the enemy.

"The Council, finding the insufficiency of their dialectics, threatened the application of more *tangible* and *convincing arguments*, which they could wield with more facility. Anathemas, excommunication, fire, and fagot, were brought into requisition. The mention of this kind of logic soon converted Berengarius, who was unambitious of the honor of martyrdom. Humbert was appointed to compose a confession for Berengarius, and executed his task to the satisfaction of his infallibility and the whole Council. This formula declared, that '*the bread and wine on the altar are the Lord's real body and blood, which not only in a sacramental, but also in a sensible manner, are broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful.*'

"Lombard censured the grossness of this confession. Simica denounced it, if not interpreted with caution and ingenuity, as a greater heresy than Berengarianism. Aquinas refers the attrition of the teeth to the species or accidents. The angelic doctors invented a plan by which the jaws could *chew form* without *substance*, and masticate *color, taste, and smell* !

"This precious specimen of blasphemy and absurdity, issued by

a Roman Council, headed by a Roman pontiff, Berengarius, through human frailty and horror of death, signed, and swore to maintain. This profession, however, was only hypocrisy, and extorted by intimidation. Shielded by the protection of his ancient patrons, he relapsed into heresy, declared his detestation of the creed which he had subscribed, and characterized the Roman Synod as an assembly of vanity, and the popedom as the throne of Satan.

"Berengarius signed a second confession, in the year 1078. Gregory VII. assembled a Roman Council for the purpose of terminating the controversy. This Synod differed from the former in its decisions. Gregory and his clergy allowed Berengarius to renounce his former confession and substitute another. This, in reality, was a virtual, if not a formal condemnation and repeal of the creed prescribed by Nicholas and his Synod, and sanctioned by their authority. This new confession merely signified, that 'the bread and wine, after consecration, became the Lord's true body and blood.'" *

"The clergy were divided in their opinions of this confession. One party acknowledged its catholicism, while another faction maintained its heresy." If we are to credit Mabillon, it was the doctrine of Gregory. He reports him to have said: "He entertained no doubt but that Berengarius had, on this institution, adopted the Scriptural idea, and all that was necessary for the faith of Catholicism." According to the same author, the Virgin Mary entertained the same view, having communicated it to him.

In the Council of Brescia, which met in 1080, Gregory himself was condemned for Berengarian heresy. The decision was, that he was guilty "of calling in question the apostolic truth of the Lord's body and blood." "The Queen of heaven" ought to have been

* Edgar's Variations.

found guilty also, and have been “transported to purgatory.”

“Gregory, importuned by some of the disaffected clergy, was induced to summon another Council for the final settlement of the controversy. A Roman Synod accordingly met at the Vatican, in 1079.” This assembly consisted of the prelaey from “the adjoining and different other regions.” It “displayed the utmost diversity of sentiment. Some held one opinion, and some another.” Berengarianism and transubstantiation swayed from side to side. A majority were in favor of the latter. “The minority represented the bread and wine only as signs, and the substantial body as sitting at the right hand of God. The disputation continued for three days. The Council in the end came to an agreement which, when compared with the two former decisions, seems to have been affected by mutual concessions. A confession was imposed on Berengarius, declaring the change in the bread and wine after consecration, to be not merely sacramental and figurative, but also true and substantial.”

Which of the infallible Councils was right? And who of the *infallible* Popes, Nicholas or Gregory?

“Transubstantiation, after the death of Berengarius, advanced by slow and gradual steps to maturity. Some continued to resist its inroads on the truths of Christian theology. But the majority of the clergy and laity, in the spirit of perversity and the phrensy of superstition, adopted the deformity. Its patrons, however, found great difficulty in moulding the monster into form. Many editions of the novelty were circulated through Christendom; and all exhibited the changes of correction and the charms of variety. The Council of the Lateran, in 1215, enrolled it among the Canons of the Romish communion; and the Lateran decision was confirmed at Constance, and finally established at Trent.”*

The history of this doctrine, therefore, demonstrates that it is a human invention. The primitive Church, in

* Dr. Edgar's Variations. The merit of these extracts atone for their length.

her purity and simplicity, established and taught as she was, by Christ and the Apostles, never heard of transubstantiation. Twelve hundred years wore away, and the dark ages threw the pall of superstition and the gloom of moral death over her, and she had utterly fallen away, ere it became an article of faith in her creed.

The early Fathers fully sustain this view—this history. They have written much, and with earnest feelings and eloquence, of the sacrament of the eucharist. But none hold the doctrine of Trent.

In his famous Apology, Justin says :

“On the day of the sun we meet. The Scriptures are read, and then an elder exhorts the people to follow such beautiful examples. We rise, we pray anew ; *water, bread, and wine* are set down. The presbyter gives thanks, and those present reply, Amen. A part of the consecrated things are distributed, and the deacons take the rest to the absent.”

Tertullian says :

“Jesus Christ having taken bread, and having distributed among his disciples, made it his body, saying, This is my body—that is to say, the *figure of my body*.”*

Thus taught Origen :

“If Christ, as the Marcionites maintain, had neither flesh nor blood, of what body and of what blood were that bread and that wine *the signs and images*.”

As this passage could not be mutilated, Origen has been called a heretic by Cardinal Duperron and others.

* “*Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum fecit, dicendo hoc est, corpus meum, id est figura corporis mei.*” Cardinal Duperron changes, in quoting it, *id est* into *scilicet* ; and makes it read, “This, to wit, the figure of my body, *is my body*. Bellarmine mutilates it. He suppresses, altogether, *id est figura.*”—BUNGNER.

Theodoret thus teaches :

“ The Lord has honored these *visible signs* with the name of his body and his blood, *not in changing their nature*, but in *adding grace to their nature*.”

The eloquent Chrysostom says :

“ Before the bread is consecrated, it is called bread ; but when divine grace has sanctified it, by the intervention of the presbyter, then it no longer bears the name of bread ; it is *worthy of being called Christ's body*, although the nature of bread remains in it.”

Marcarius thus teaches :

“ Bread and wine are offered, being the *figure* of the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. They who participate in this visible bread, *eat spiritually* the flesh of the Lord.”

St. Augustine, a great favorite with Rome, says :

“ The Lord had no difficulty in saying, This is my body, when he gave the *sign* of his body.”

In his epistle to Boniface :

“ Had the sacraments no resemblance to the things whereof they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments. But, in consequence of that resemblance, they take, most frequently, the name of the things themselves.”

Cyril, Jerome, Vigilius, Ephrem, and many others, speak, in glowing strains of eloquence, of the holy eucharist ; but not one says one word about transubstantiation. On this doctrine, as now held by Rome, they are silent. This Cardinal Bellarmine, as we have seen, virtually admits. Bruys frankly confesses, “ that transubstantiation was a discovery of the ninth century.” He alludes to the doctrine and bold preaching of Pascasius. The celebrated Erasmus says : “ The

Church was late in defining transubstantiation." And Scotus acknowledges, as all who are acquainted with ecclesiastical history know, "That transubstantiation was not an article of faith before the Council of Lateran, in 1215."

What, then, becomes of the bold affirmation of the Trent Fathers, that this doctrine "has been always believed in the Church of God"? The argument is complete, the evidence overwhelming, that it is a human invention of the dark ages; a doctrine of "seducing spirits."

But this doctrine is not only without scriptural warrant and ignored by the practice of the primitive Church; and without any support from tradition or ecclesiastical history for eight hundred years, and therefore a heresy, as Rome loves to call everything which agrees not with her standard of faith; but it is an error which, like infallibility, draws after it, as effect follows cause, many other errors and evils.

IT TENDS TO MATERIALISM.

If "by the prayer of consecration the *whole substance* of the bread is changed into the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the appearance *only* of bread and wine remaining," so that "the bread and wine on the altar are the Lord's *real body* and *blood*, which, in a *sensible* manner, are broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful," what is it but materialism? "The faithful" are taught, as we have seen, that sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*; and hence, to eat the real body and drink the real blood of Christ, what is it

but to be made a partaker of him *physically*, or in a *material* sense? This conclusion is not strained. It follows from their own premises as naturally and as necessarily as water flows down hill.

IT LEADS TO INFIDELITY.

This, the view just presented demonstrates. But furthermore, there are millions who cannot believe that Christ is—can be present *whole and entire* in a piece of bread, which has, as it lies before them, and as they taste it, all the properties of bread, because it contradicts their senses, and is philosophically absurd. And yet they are taught that it is of divine institution; and if they believe it not, they are unceremoniously, and, I fear, with a demon-like feeling, anathematized—damned for not believing what they cannot believe. The intelligent mind revolts, and, in Roman Catholic countries, where the blessed Bible is prohibited and the light of a pure Gospel shines not, goes off into skepticism—atheism. If the history of infidelity in France were written out, from its first buddings in the deep, doubting recesses of the inquiring, thinking soul, that felt its own weakness and its own power, up to the days of the “Reign of Terror,” when it culminated, it would show, I doubt not, with the clearness of the noonday, that the theology, and intolerant, persecuting, blood-thirsty spirit of Rome, had given or forced it into being, and supplied it with aliment. And the doctrine of transubstantiation occupies a pre-eminent position in effecting this sad work. This question, therefore, is one which should be thoroughly investigated. The plan

and limits of this work forbid further inquiry into this dark and monstrously interesting theme. Oh, that some Chalmers or Clarke would penetrate its hidden recesses, and open to the gaze of Christians and to the mind of the bewildered unfortunate skeptic its profound depths, and lead him out into the glorious light of the religion which came from God!

IT IS BLASPHEMOUS.

The priest creates God, and bows down and adores Him, and then eats and inwardly digests him! And "the faithful" also "adore," and then "grind Him between their teeth" and "swallow" Him.

The confession imposed upon Berengarius, to support and defend which he was compelled to swear, will be remembered: "The bread and wine on the altar are the Lord's real body and blood, which, not only in a sacramental, but also in a sensible manner, are broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful"! Language is too tame when this is simply characterized as blasphemous. The most bitter skeptic and enemy of the cross could hardly have framed a sentence soaring higher in this most detestable sin. *By the hands, God is broken! by the teeth, ground!* * * * * Averroes, an Arabian philosopher, exclaimed, "I have travelled over the world, and have found divers sects; but so sottish a sect I never found as is the sect of the Christians; because with their own teeth they devour their God whom they worship."

"When we call the fruits of the earth Ceres, and wine Bacchus, we use but the common language," said

Tully, a heathen; "but," he adds, "do you think any man so mad as to believe that which he eats to be God?"

The classic scholar will recollect the exclamation of Cicero, "Whom do you think so demented as to believe what he eats to be God?"

A Jew exclaimed: "Christians eat their God."

THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION LEADS TO IDOLATRY.

When the priest has read the prayer of consecration, and has changed the bread into God, he "elevates the host," and all "the faithful" fall down and worship. That they worship "the body of Christ," into which, they say, the bread has been converted, but which, we affirm, is bread still, they frankly admit. An able Roman Catholic writer says, "The papist believes of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist consecrated now by priests, that it really contains the body of Christ, and his blood; which being there united with the divinity, *he confesses the whole Christ to be present and him he adores.*" But more of this when I come to speak of the idolatry of Rome.

IT DEIFIES THE PRIEST, AND EXALTS HIM ABOVE GOD.

The priest creates God, creates Him at pleasure out of bread!

Now, he who creates is greater than that which is created—is a trite axiom within the comprehension of all. He who creates God must be "above God."

Cardinal Biel, an honored son of the Church, says,

"He that created me, gave me, if it be lawful to tell, to *create himself*."

Pope Urban II. said, in a large public assembly :

*"The hands of the Pontiff are raised to an eminence granted to none of the angels, of CREATING GOD THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS, and of offering him up for the salvation of the whole world."**

"We confess that the priest is greater than Mary herself, the mother of God. She gave birth to Christ but once ; but the *priest creates him when he pleases, and as oft-n as he pleases*. Such is the tenor of a form of abjuration imposed, at the commencement of the last century, on the peasants of Hungary. Although the authenticity of this has been disputed, these lines, extraordinary as they are to *reasonable* Roman Catholics, are not the less, if we admit the real presence, rigorously true. What Mary, blessed among all women, viewed as the most glorious and sacred of favors, there are three or four hundred thousand priests throughout the world to whom it is a thing of daily and very simple occurrence. And when one thinks that the *most impure and criminal* of men may, in a few seconds, with a few hastily-uttered words, perform, *when he pleases, this prodigy of prodigies*, your head swims, in truth, in view of such an abyss of inconsistencies and pride. All that Egypt or India ever imagined, in the way of fabulous monstrosity for the elevation of their priests above the ordinary level of humanity, has been outdone by Rome, in teaching transubstantiation."†

The authenticity of this abjuration may be called in question, but it avails nothing. Father Biel uses language of the same import ; and Urban's, as we have seen, if possible, is more monstrous and blasphemous. Biel says, "Her ladyship once conceived the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world ; *while the priest daily calls into existence the same Deity*." * * *

What blasphemy ! What iniquity ! Man is exalted

* Bruys, Hoveden and others, give this. † Bungener's History.

into a God! nay, above the Deity of the heavens, whom, though pre-existent, and “over all blessed forever more,” he “daily calls into existence,” “creating the Creator of all things”!

The predicted apostasy has reached its culminating point. The picture drawn by the Apostle eighteen hundred years ago, is filled up, in all its dark outlines and details, by the Church of Rome, and not a lingering doubt can remain that she is *the Antichrist*.

* * * * *

* * * * * “Let no man deceive you; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition; who opposeth and EXALTETH HIMSELF ABOVE ALL THAT IS CALLED GOD, OR THAT IS WORSHIPPED; SO THAT HE, AS GOD, SITTETH IN THE TEMPLE OF GOD, SHOWING HIMSELF THAT HE IS GOD.”

IT “LAYS ANOTHER FOUNDATION THAN THAT IS LAID, JESUS CHRIST.”

It is “a sacrifice for sins for the quick and the dead.” By it, as a sacrifice, men are saved from sin in this life and from the temporal punishment due to sin in the world to come; or out of purgatory. As the priest creates God out of bread, so he offers Him, under the appearance of bread, as an “acceptable sacrifice” “for the salvation of the world.” This is most distinctly affirmed. Bread is offered unto God as an atonement for transgression, and over the bread-sacrifice the priest intercedes for “the transgressors.” If this is not laying another foundation; if it is not another Gospel, I know not what is. “The Spirit speaketh expressly,

that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."

Extreme Unction.

Extreme unction, in the creed of Rome, is *the anointing of the sick, for the remission of sins*, who are supposed to be at the very verge of death, *with consecrated or holy oil*. This anointing was decreed to be a sacrament, by the Council of Trent. "The oil is applied by the thumb of a bishop or priest, who only can officiate, in this ordinance, to the *eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, feet*, and, if the patient be a male, to the *loins*; to every member that is supposed to have been instrumental in sinning. A form of prayer is used. This sacrament, it is affirmed, "remits sins," and fits the departing soul for heaven. But, that the reader may know the nature and object of this ordinance, as held and practiced by the Church of Rome, I will lay before him the decree of the Council. It is explicit and emphatic. It runs thus:

"Canon 1. If any shall say *extreme unction* is not, truly and properly, a *sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord, and preached by the apostle St. James*, but that it is a human invention, let him be accursed.

"Canon 2. If any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick *doth not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor relieve the sick*; but that it had long since ceased, as if of old, it hath only been the grace of healing, let him be accursed."

Now, I most distinctly deny that it is "a sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord," or that it "remits sins," and affirm "that it is a human invention."

And, first of all, the Trent Fathers themselves admit,

in this very decree, that Christ never instituted extreme unction as a sacrament, or anything else. They say:

“This holy anointing of the sick is *instituted*, as it were, to be a true and proper sacrament of the New Testament; *insinuated*, indeed, by Christ our Lord, in St. Mark, but recommended and preached to the faithful by the apostle St. James.”*

Insinuated by Christ! and yet *instituted* by him! After the decree was framed in the congregation, one of the divines suggested that Christ could not have instituted this sacrament before he constituted his disciples priests; and that, all agreed, he did not do until he instituted the Supper. The ground, therefore, was changed. The passage in St. Mark, on which they had relied: “And they (the disciples) cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them,”† was to be understood, not as instituting, but as insinuating it. This was the strongest passage, and the only one worthy of note, be it known, brought forward by the advocates of this doctrine, to demonstrate that Christ instituted anointing with oil, or extreme unction, as a sacrament; but this was given up, because the disciples were not the priests, and Christ could only *insinuate* it! Where, then, is the institution by Christ, our Lord?—the solemn command and formula, exalting the anointing of the sick with oil into the dignity

* “Instituta est autem sacra hec unctio infirmorum, tanquam vere et proprie sacramentum Novi Testamenti, a Christo Domino nostro, apud Marcum, quidem *insinuatam*, per Jacobum autem apostotum fidelibus commendatum ac promulgatum.” This is their precise language. Judge ye.

† Mark vi. 13. But here it is not even hinted that it remits sins, but was a form used when the disciples miraculously healed.

of a sacrament? Where? Were it not for the momentous issues involved in, and the awful solemnity of this question, one could not repress laughter at the strange and absurd idea, that the divine Legislator would only *insinuate* a doctrine essential to the remission of sins and the salvation of the soul. As, then, Christ did not institute, but only insinuate this sacrament—and the Roman Catechism agrees with the preamble of the Trent Fathers—the whole controversy turns upon the preaching of St. James, who, it is affirmed, promulgated and established it. What, then, did St. James teach? In the v. chapter, 14th and 15th verses, he gives the following instructions:

“Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.”

This is all he says concerning this doctrine. Does this sustain, establish it, as Rome affirms? Let us analyze this language and critically examine it, and I think it will clearly appear that it does not even *insinuate* it.

“*Is any sick among you? let him call for the (Presbyteri) elders.*” Were they priests? The Council affirmed they were. No proof, however, is given to support their assumption. I affirm they were not. The terms they and St. James use are different, and mean different things. “The elders” may not even have been ministers. Furthermore, St. James uses the plural throughout. *Elders* were to anoint—they were to pray. The council requires but one priest—he does

all the *manipulating*, all the *praying*. The Council, then, have departed from St. James in having but one administrator, and in assuming that he must be a priest.

"*Anointing him with oil.*" What kind of oil? Common olive oil is the most reasonable conclusion, as that was used by the Jews as a healing remedy. At any rate, it was not *consecrated*; but the Council requires as absolutely essential oil that has been consecrated by a bishop. If that be wanting, the dying one must perish. The application of the oil to the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, feet, and loins, and the sign of the cross each time, is not mentioned, is not required by St. James. All this, therefore, is a departure from apostolic teachings, and is of human invention.

"*And the prayer of faith shall save the sick.*" The anointing, then, has no efficacy; not the least is ascribed to it. It does not heal, nor save—remits no sin, and therefore cannot be a sacrament in the sense Rome holds, conferring grace, *ex opere operato*. The prayer of faith saves, and that only, by the grace of God vouchsafed in answer thereto; for "*the Lord shall raise him up.*"

"*And if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.*" By whom shall they be forgiven? By the "elders"? This is not hinted at by St. James, nor does even the Council affirm it. The Council has taught elsewhere, as we have seen, that the priest can remit sins. Why not, then, in this fatal hour, without anointing with oil? Does the application of the oil and the sign of the cross "forgive him"? Nay; the thought is not only superlatively absurd, but the ex-

pressions used cannot be made to convey such an idea. By whom then are his sins forgiven him? By the Lord, who "raises him up," and by Him only. No other idea is conveyed by St. James; no other doctrine can be tortured out of his language. The anointing, then, neither "confers grace," nor "remits sins." God does both in answer to the prayer of faith.

The doctrine, then, of extreme unction, as a sacrament—a sacrament that "confers grace" and "remits sins," is not promulgated by St. James, nor even "insinuated" by him. And in the *administration, sign, form, subject, and end or effects* of this ordinance, as the Council would call it, but simple advice, we say, Rome differs from St. James. Everything is changed. St. James requires two or more administrators, and they elders; Rome but one, and he a priest or bishop. St. James would anoint with simple oil; Rome with consecrated or holy oil. The former would apply it once, doubtless, to the head, and without any manipulating and crossing; the latter repeatedly, and to the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, feet, and loins, with genuflections and crossings. St. James would anoint the sick not sinking in death; Rome only the dying. The former would apply the oil and pray to raise him up, the latter to remit his sins and fit him for the judgment. Rome, therefore, has changed everything; and hence is without Scriptural authority in all, and even the sanction of apostolic tradition.

Dr. Clarke's comment on this text is so clear, though similar to some of the thoughts I have just advanced, that I will present it in part to the reader:

“That the *anointing* recommended by St. James cannot be such as the Romish Church prescribes, and it is on this passage principally that they found their sacrament of *extreme unction*, is evident from these considerations : 1. St. James orders the sick person to be *anointed* in reference to *his cure* ; but they anoint the sick in the *agonies of death*, when there is *no prospect of his recovery* ; and never administer that *sacrament*, as it is called, while there is *any hope of life*. 2. St. James orders this *anointing* for the cure of the *body*, but they apply it for the cure of the *soul* ; in reference to which use of it St. James gives no directions ; and what is said of *forgiveness of sins*, in verse 15, is rather to be referred to *faith and prayer*, which are often the means of restoring lost health, and preventing premature death, when *natural means*, the most skilfully used, have been useless. 3. The *anointing with oil*, if ever used as a means or *symbol* in *working miraculous cures*, was only applied in *some cases*, perhaps *very few*, if any ; but the Romish Church uses it in *every case* ; and makes it *necessary* to the *salvation* of every departing soul. Therefore *St. James’ unction*, and the *extreme unction* of the Romish Church, are essentially different.”

Many able Roman Catholic writers—men of acknowledged ability and undoubted Catholicity, Rome herself being judge—have admitted that this doctrine has no clear foundation in Scripture, was not unequivocally, like baptism, instituted by Christ. Cardinal Cajetan says :

“Neither the words nor the results announced here, in St. Mark and St. James, *indicate* the sacramental unction of extreme unction.”*

“Saurez on Extreme Unction tells us, that ‘Hugo of St. Victor, Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, Attissidore, &c., denied this sacrament to have been instituted by Christ ; and by plain consequence, it was not a true sacrament.’”†

* Nec ex verbis nec ex effectis, verba hæc loquantur de sacramentali unctione extremæ unctionis.—*Works*, vol. ii.

† Ousley.

"Until the days of Peter Lombard (Anno. 1145), scarce any author could be found who rashly set down any certain number of sacraments, save those two of our salvation of which there is no dispute." *

"Without prejudice, it must be acknowledged, that neither did our Lord institute this sacrament or dispense it, nor did his Apostles." †

"Chemnitius saith: 'The progress of this unction clearly shows it to be no sacrament; for first, the Apostles anointed the sick with common oil to heal them; then others began to add benediction and to consecrate the oil, but yet they used it to the same end for which the Apostles used it before, viz., to cure the sick *miraculously*, as appears by the miracles said to be done with holy oil by St. Martin and many others. But when at length miracles were quite ceased, the *ceremony of anointing* still went on.' " ‡

"Extreme unction," says Dr. Edgar, "is a variation from *tradition*, as well as from revelation. The ceremony is destitute of written and unwritten authority, and was unknown both to the Apostles and Fathers of antiquity. Fleury, Ward, Sclater, Mumford, and Challoner, in consequence, forbear, on this topic, to make any quotations from the records of early Christianity. * * * Bellarmine endeavors to excuse the ancients for omitting the history of this sacrament in their works, by alleging their want of occasion. The cardinal, for once, was right. The early Christian authors had no opportunity of discussing a non-entity.

"The Rhemists admit that the fathers of the first four centuries make no mention of this institution. * * * The concession, in reality, is an abandonment of the cause, so far as concerns this source of evidence. Four hundred revolving years ran their ample round, and left no trace of this sacrament. The apostolic men, Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, lived, and wrote, and departed, without once mentioning the sacrament of the dying. The successors of the apostolic men, such as Justin, Irenæus, Clemens, Tertullian, Cyprian, Altrenagorus, Tatian, Epiphanius, and the apostolic constitutions, are, on this theme, equally silent and

* Cassander, quoted by Ousley.

† Alexander of Hales.

‡ Quoted by Ousley.

disobliging. The pretended Dionysius, who has left circumstantial details on similar topics, has, says Aquinas, made no mention of extreme unction. These authors have emblazoned the other sacraments in their works, and drawn minute delineations of baptism and the communion. These topics meet the reader's eye in nearly every page of their literary productions. But extreme unction, wonderful to tell, is never mentioned. This ceremony, which, in modern days, remits sin and strengthens the soul of the dying, forms no part of either the light or shade of the picture sketched by the pen of antiquity. This was a woful and vexatious omission in the good fathers, and has put many moderns to a sad puzzle.

"The Christian men and women of old, such as Constantine, Helen, Anthony, Basil, Chrysostom, Monica, and Augustine, whose death-bed biography has been transmitted to the present day, seem never to have been anointed. Their biographers never so much as mention the sacrament of the dying. All these, it is to be feared, departed without the application of the blessed oil. The holy men and women, in all probability, contrived getting to heaven without being greased for the journey. But the modern saints and sinners of Romanism are prepared for heaven, or purgatory, by consecrated oil. The death of many, in latter days, has been recorded by Surius and Butler; and these, on their death-bed, were always complimented with a plaster of blessed ointment. The modern saints make their exit from time, and their entrance into eternity, ornamented in seven different places, with the cross-streaks of the oily figures, formed by the graceful motion of the sacerdotal thumb.*

"The friends of this ceremony have endeavored to prop the baseless fabric by historical testimony, extracted from the annals of the fifth and following centuries."

But in this, as Dr. Edgar shows, they have signally failed. He follows the stream of history, touching this doctrine, through Councils and the misty mazes of superstitious writings, and thus closes:

"The history of this innovation is easily traced. Extreme unction, in its present form, was the child of the twelfth century. The

* In contagious diseases, the priest applies the oil with a long rod!

monuments of Christian theology, for eleven hundred years, mention no ceremony which, in it its varied and unmeaning mummery, corresponds with the unction of Romanism. The patrons of this superstition have rifled the annals of ecclesiastical history for eleven ages, and have failed in the discovery of either precept or example for a rite which, they affirm, was practiced, as a sacrament, in every nation of Christendom, since the era of redemption.

"The twelfth century, of which this filthy ceremony is the offspring, was the reign of ignorance and superstition. Science and literature seemed, in disgust, to fly from a tasteless and degenerate world. Philosophy refused to shed a single ray on a grovelling race, who hated or despised its light. Immorality, as usual, kept pace with barbarism. Moral and intellectual darkness commingled their clouds around man, for the purpose of forming a night of concentrated horror and atrocity. The king and the subject, the clergy and the laity, conspired against all information; while the Sun of Righteousness seemed to withdraw his beams from a wicked and a wandering world.*

"Amid this intellectual and moral darkness, the apostolic ceremony, noticed by Mark and James, degenerated, by accumulated innovations, into the Romish sacrament. Superstition, from her overflowing fountain, poured her copious streams, which mingling, but not united with the Scriptural spring, formed the heterogeneous and unsightly mass. The simple rite was transformed into the clumsy sacrament. The original unction, intended for the recovery of health to particular individuals, continued, while the gift of healing and the power of working miracles remained. But these, in process of time, ceased; and the weakness of man prompted many to use the external rite, after the miraculous power was suspended,

* Dr. Ives, late episcopal bishop of the P. E. Church, in North Carolina, said, in a recent lecture in Philadelphia, that that was the glorious age of the Church. No heresies cursed and distracted her, for the reason that then the priest instructed the people orally, and they only received knowledge at his lips, and were not cursed with the light and knowledge diffused by printing presses and books! This is Romanism. Give her the power, and she will turn the clock of the world back five hundred years, and spread the pall of the "glorious" dark ages over the Church and the world again.

The patient's health, not, indeed, by the miraculous application of the oil, but by the ordinary operations of Providence, was sometimes restored ; and the recovery, in these cases, was ascribed to the ointment. But many, though anointed, died ; and the observance, in these instances, though the body suffered, was supposed to be beneficial to the soul. The recovery of health, therefore, was accounted conditional, and the good of the soul was reckoned certain. Superstition, from day to day, and from age to age, appended new additions to the growing ceremony. The episcopal consecration of the oil, its indiscriminate application, and other innovations, dictated by the demon of superstition, were superinduced on the pristine institution. The filthy progeny of ignorance and superstition came, at last, to maturity. Bernard, Victor, and Lombard, in the twelfth century, speak of the unction of the sick in modern language, enlarged with the multiplied accessions of eleven hundred years. Albert, Aquinas, and other schoolmen, touched the picture with characteristic subtlety. These theological projectors brought the system to perfection, and exhibited it to the world in a finished form. The novelty, in 1439, was adopted by Pope Eugenius and the Florentine Council, and stamped with the seal of their unqualified approbation and synodal infallibility."

The infallible Council of Trent gave it the finishing touch ; and now, "if any shall say, *extreme unction* is not *truly* and *properly* a *sacrament instituted by Christ our Lord*, and *preached by the Apostle, St. James* ; but that it is a *human invention*, and *doth not confer grace*, nor *remit sins*, LET HIM BE ACCURSED" !!

Finally, this doctrine is not only without Scriptural warrant and traditional support, but it is wholly unnecessary, one can but believe, if penance and indulgences confer grace and remit sins, and if transubstantiation imparts the divine nature and makes a partaker of the blessed body and blood of Christ, all of which Rome has decreed and "the faithful" believe. Why, to offer the dying, after they have purchased and fully realized

and enjoyed all these, the sacrament of extreme unction to "remit sins," is a solemn mockery and an insult, or in receiving them they have been trifled with and deceived. If the sacrament of penance has not "remitted sins," and the "indulgence" has not made the "soul pure" and "remitted the punishment due to sin," and if the "soul, body, and divinity of Jesus Christ" have not been received in the Supper, and the faithful, consequently, are not "partakers of the divine nature," but are sinners, what confidence can the dying have in the remission of sins by extreme unction? If "infallible Mother Church" was mistaken in the efficacy of those, or has deceived—and if not, the recipients must have been pardoned and purified and justified of all punishment, and assimilated to the divine nature, and therefore have no need of extreme unction—she may be mistaken or deceive in this. The dying, therefore, are deluded with the vain hope that the holy (?) anointing by the priest—the priest who has absolved them, and at whose hands they have taken and eaten their Saviour, but without remission or salvation, they are now virtually told—will give them a safe exit and happy passport to bliss immortal. Oh, vain delusion! consecrated oil remits no sin, saves no soul. What a "mystery of iniquity" is Rome! What "deceivableness in unrighteousness"!

Purgatory.

"*Purgatory*," in the theology of Rome, "is a middle place or state, in which departed souls make expiation for venial faults and for the temporal punishment of mortal

sins." This Church holds sins to be "*venial* or *mortal*;" that is, "as trivial or aggravated." All who die guilty of "*mortal* or *aggravated*" sins go direct to hell, whence there is no escape. All who die without "*venial*" sins, or if they have been remitted, and with the *remission of the temporal punishment due to all crimes*, go immediately to heaven. But all who throw off this "mortal coil," with "*venial*" faults and temporal punishments "*unremitted*," must go to purgatory, and undergo the punishment justly due; and thence, purified by its penal fires, pass into heaven. Hence, the Councils of Florence and Trent taught that there are three classes of the human family: saints, sinners, and an intermediate class. Saints go to heaven, bad sinners to hell, and the intermediate class, or "*venial*" sinners, to purgatory.

This is a prominent and a cherished doctrine in the creed of this fallen Church.

The Council of Trent, in its decree on purgatory, says:

"There is a purgatory; and the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but most of all by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar," or mass; and makes it absolutely obligatory upon all priests "constantly to hold, and most diligently to teach, that there is a purgatory."

In the creed of Pius IV., to which every Roman Catholic must subscribe, with the solemnity of an oath, we have this language:

"I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful."

It is somewhat remarkable that the Council did not

claim high Scripture warrant for this doctrine, as in the case of penance, and transubstantiation, and extreme unction, and that the decree is accompanied with no anathema. For once, then, we can *deny* that a doctrine held by Rome is of *divine institution*, and *breathe easy*! No curse hickers in the heavens, no purgatorial or worse fires blaze beneath our feet. Was the Council in such haste, though from the opening session to the close was only eighteen years, that it could not take time to write, "If any one shall say that purgatory was not *insinuated* by Christ and preached by Paul and Peter, let him be accursed"? or, were the members so fully conscious, so positively certain, that it had no shadow of foundation in Scripture, or in apostolic tradition, that it would be an unheard-of cruelty, even in Rome, to damn a man outright for doubting it? Or was it because the closing anathemas, which sanctioned and embraced all the decrees, would cover and defend this? The last words of that Council were: "Anathema"! "*Anathema*"! "ANATHEMA"!

Be this as it may, many able writers, since the days of Aquinas, have taught that this dogma is of divine origin, and have quoted and learnedly commented upon several passages in the New Testament to support their position. As many more, and fully as able, have confessed that this doctrine has no foundation in Scripture. When *infallible* doctors disagree, who shall decide?

Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," in the midst of a grave argument and with evident feelings of triumph, asks:

"What place must that be which our Saviour called Abraham's bosom, where Lazarus *reposed*, among other just souls, till he by his

passion, paid their ransom? * Not heaven, but evidently a *middle state*. Again, of what place is it that St. Peter speaks, where Christ preached to those spirits that were in prison? † It is evidently the same that is mentioned in the Apostles' creed. 'He descended into hell,' not the hell of the damned, surely, but the prison above mentioned, or Abraham's bosom; in short, a middle state."

"Abraham's bosom" a "prison"! "purgatory"! the "hell" into which the Saviour descended when he "preached to those spirits that were in prison"! But what does the inspired evangelist teach? Abraham addressing the rich man, far across the impassable gulf, said, "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now *he is comforted* and thou art tormented. "Lazarus" "comforted" in "purgatory"! One would suppose that priests would not be anxious to pray souls *out of such a place*, and that "the faithful" would not give very freely of their hard earnings for masses to bring departed loved ones from such "comforts"!

But why did "Lazarus, and Abraham and other just souls," remain in that place of comfort till Christ "by his passion paid their ransom"? Ah, poor souls! there were no priests to offer up the sacrifice of the altar for them, no faithful whose suffrages could reach and relieve them! Though Moses and the Prophets and priests had lived and died, they "reposed" there and were "comforted," "till He, by his pardon, paid their ransom." But if they were "*just*," what ransom did they need? And finally, was not that ransom made for every soul of man? And if it redeemed and brought out of "the prison" of Abraham's bosom

* Luke xvi. 19-31.

† 1 Peter iii. 19.

Lazarus and other just souls, will it not save *from* that prison just souls departing now? So much for an argument so at variance with Scripture and common sense, and so flimsy withal, that I find it difficult to reply to it without being exceedingly trite and common place.

But this argument is not only at variance with Scripture and common sense, but with the very nature of purgatory itself, as set forth by Popes, Councils, and theologians. Purgatory, as its name imports, is a place of cleansing, of purgation by *suffering*. Hence, it has been represented as a place in which the soul suffers keenest torture by fire, and endures most exquisite mental anguish.

"Many have represented water, accompanied with darkness, tempest, whirlwind, snow, ice, frost, hail, and rain, as the means of purgatorial atonement. *Perpetua*, in a vision, saw a pond in this land of temporary penalty, though its waters were inaccessible to the thirsty inhabitants, whom it only tantalized with illusive mockery."* "The water of this country, in the most authentic accounts, is both hot and cold : and the wretched inhabitants pass in rapid but painful transition from the warm to the frosty element—from the torrid to the frigid zone. The purgatorians enjoy, in succession, the cool and tepid bath : and are transferred, without any useless ceremony, from the icy pond to the boiling cauldron."†

Paris‡ gives the story of one Enus, who, he affirms, beheld by invoking the protection and the favor of the Son of God, the punishment of the wretched souls confined in purgatory. He went down, he informs us, in the spirit of course, not like poets of old into Pluto's dark domain, but into the "middle place"—the purga-

* This story is given both by Bede and Bellarmine.

† Edgar's Variations.

‡ Paris: pp. 83, 84.

torian world, and saw suffering souls and heard their groans. Dr. Edgar has condensed this wonderful story, and I give it in his words:

“Numberless men and women, lying naked on the earth and transixed with red-hot nails, bit the dust with pain. Devils lashed some with dreadful whips. Fiery dragons gnawed some with ignited teeth; while flaming serpents pierced others with burning stings. Toads of amazing size and terror endeavored, with ugly beaks, to extract the hearts of many. Monstrous deformed worms, breathing fire from their mouths, devoured some with insatiable voracity. Some hung in sulphurous flames, with chains through their feet, legs, hands, arms, and heads, or with iron hooks in a state of ignition through their eyes, nose, jaws, and breasts. Some were roasted on spits, fried in pans, or boiled in furnaces. Many were hurled headlong into a fetid, tumbling, roaring river, and if any raised their heads above the surface, devils, running along the stream, sunk them again into the cold element. A sulphurous well, emitting flame and stench, threw up men like sparkling scintillations, into the air, and again received them falling into its burning mouth.”

Such, then, is purgatory, according to Bede, Bellarmine, Paris, Alexander, and every other Romanist whose writings I have examined, or whose opinions I have seen quoted, who has expressed himself on this subject, save Dr. Miller. Roman Catholic priests in Europe and America everywhere represent, at this day, that purgatory is a place of suffering. Without suffering, in a word, all agree, it would not be purgatory. And yet Dr. Miller says: Abraham's bosom is purgatory, and that just souls repose there! Lazarus, we know, in that state, was comforted. To *such* a purgatory, may the writer and the reader go when the toils of life are over!

Dr. Challoner, in his “Catholic Christian,” labors

hard to sustain this unscriptural dogma by the declaration of our Saviour that the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven in eternity. The Saviour says: "*The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.*"* Thus Dr. Challoner reasons:

"Our Lord would not have mentioned forgiveness in the world to come, *if sins, not forgiven in this world, could not be forgiven in the world to come*; then, there must be a purgatory; for no sin can enter into heaven to be forgiven there, and in hell there is no forgiveness at all."

What masterly logic! How lucid and triumphant this argument! Some sins will never be forgiven in the world to come; therefore, some sins will; therefore, "there must be a purgatory"! The conclusion is based upon an inference, which inference is a fallacy. As one sin cannot be forgiven in the world to come, the inference is, others may. In other words, if Christ had said that a certain sin cannot be forgiven in this world, we would have reasonably concluded that all other sins may be; that all others are of a nature to be forgiven. So in eternity, Dr. Challoner contends. But his inference is a sophism; first, because, so far as we know, so far as God has revealed the plan of salvation, there are no means of remitting sins, and no promise of forgiveness in eternity. To reply that purgatorial fires, or sufferings of any kind, or indulgences bought, or masses said on earth for souls confined there, are the means, is to assume the truth of the doctrine in dispute. We deny that there is a purgatory, and ask what means will cleanse the soul, or remit sins in the

* Matt. xii. 32.

world to come, and the reply is, and the only reply which can be given, purgatorial fires, and masses, &c., assuming what we deny.

In the next place, the inference proves too much, if it prove anything. If we suppose that any sins, not against the Holy Ghost, can be forgiven in the world to come, we must suppose, for the same reason, that *all sins*, except that one, can be forgiven. And hence, every sinner who dies in his sins, who has not committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, can be forgiven in the world to come! Is there a chance, then, for all of us, maugre the thunders of Rome, through the fires of purgatory, to reach at last the haven of repose? But alas for us, and for this interpretation, "Mother Church" teaches, that all who die in "mortal sin" go to hell, whence there is no redemption. This passage, then, does not *insinuate*, much less prove, the doctrine of a middle state of purgation.

The next passage on which the advocates of this dogma rely to demonstrate its truth, is Matt. v. 26: "*Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence* (of prison, see verse 24), *till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.*" Bellarmine, Challoner, Milner, and others, say, the prison mentioned by our Lord is purgatory; and that when the sufferer has paid the debt, or expiated the crime, or crimes for which he was cast into that prison, he will come out.

"Many Romish saints and commentators, however, give a different explanation. Augustine, Jerome, Bede, Maldonat, and Alexander, say the prison is hell, and the punishment everlasting." "According to the canonized commentator of Palestine, 'The person who does not before the end of his life pay the last farthing,

mentioned in the words of the inspired penman, will never be released from the prison!"*"

Bede says, "the term *until* signifies endless duration," as in the expression of David, cited by Paul, which he quotes to sustain his view: "Till I put all his enemies under his feet." "Till," in this sentence, evidently means forever; for Christ will reign not only when all enemies are put under his feet, but forever. "Maldonat," says Edgar, "concurrs" in this interpretation. He says, "The prison signifies hell, from which the debtor, who will be punished with the utmost vigor, will never escape, *because he will never pay.*"

Alexander, the learned Sorbonnist, very ably sustains this interpretation and refutes Bellarmine, and leaves no ground on which for Challoner and Milner to stand. The Saviour's language, he argues, "signifies not whence he will afterward depart, but whence he will never depart. The words are spoken of hell, from which the condemned, who undergo the infinite punishment of mortal sin, which they can never pay, will never be released." Till, when applied to things in eternity, means forever. "God invites his son to sit at his right hand, till his enemies should become his footstool. But he will not then leave his seat." He will sit there forever. So the person in prison unable to pay will never come out. Dr. Clarke in his comment on this passage, remarks

"This text has been considered a proper foundation on which to build not only the doctrine of a *purgatory*, but also that of *universal restoration*. But the most unwarrantable violence must be used

* Edgar.

before it can be pressed into the service of either of the above *unscriptural* doctrines. At the most, the text can only be considered as a *metaphorical* representation of the procedure of the great Judge; and let it ever be remembered, that by the general consent of all (except the basely interested), no *metaphor* is ever to be *produced* in proof of any doctrine. In the things that concern our eternal salvation, we need the most *pointed and express evidence* on which to establish the faith of our souls."

There is another view which is fatal to the interpretation of Bellarmine, and all of that school. The Saviour says the prisoner shall not come out till *he has paid the uttermost farthing*. But the Council of Trent affirms, as already quoted, that "the souls detained in purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but most of all, by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar." Now, if the soul in purgatory is helped by the suffrages of the faithful, and especially by the sacrifice of the altar, what is the nature and extent of that help? They can cancel none of the prisoner's debt, according to the plain word of the Great Teacher. The infallible Council therefore was wrong, or the Teacher whom all *know* to be *infallible* was mistaken, or deceived us in teaching that the poor soul must suffer in its purgatorial prison or hell, till the penal fires there shall have burned out all its venial stains—or this doctrine has no foundation in the text.

Paul's language to the Corinthians has been brought into requisition, and made to prove the existence of a purgatory. The whole passage reads thus:

"For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ? Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be

revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."*

This passage is somewhat mysterious, and hence susceptible of being misunderstood, and of false interpretations. It should not be brought forward, therefore, to sustain any doctrine not elsewhere clearly revealed in the Scriptures. Almost any theory may be sustained according to such principles of exegesis. However, that I may not be misunderstood, this text does not *insinuate*, much less prove, the doctrine of purgatory.

First of all, the language of the Apostle, as to works and trying them, is highly *figurative*: "If any man build upon this foundation, *gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble*." By the terms *gold, silver, &c.*, the Apostle does not mean the *precious metals*, but the *doctrine* and *practice* of the builder. By the term *fire*, then, he cannot mean *real, literal fire*, but some scrutinizing test, which, like fire, will show the gold, silver, precious stones, from the wood, hay, stubble; or good doctrines from doubtful, or speculative and false. To teach that the Apostle uses figurative terms in speaking of doctrines—and all must admit this—and that he uses, in the same sentence, as their parallel, a *literal* one, is to make him, learned as he was and inspired withal, a literary pretender and a blind guide.

Furthermore, the Apostle does not say, "shall be saved *by fire*," but, "*so as by fire*." If the term fire, therefore, be taken in a literal sense—but this view

* 1 Cor. iii. 11-15,

shows it cannot—the Apostle uses it to show, not that the builder will pass through it, but through a judgment ordeal that will test, or try his work like as fire; and he shall be saved, not *by*, but *so as by* fire. He uses the term fire, therefore, to represent something else; what this something else is, which fire *symbolically* represents, we are left to conjecture, and the learned widely disagree concerning it. Some say it is affliction, and an adverse, scrutinizing Providence in this life. Others, that it is the final judgment; and yet others—the Greek Church and Greek theologians generally, that it is future punishment.

“The Scriptural language, in this case,” says Dr. Edgar, “is *metaphorical*. The super-structure, consisting of gold, silver, and precious stones, or of wood, hay, and stubble, as well as the scrutinizing flame, all these are not literal but figurative. The phrase, ‘*so as*,’ it is plain, denotes a comparison. The salvation, which is accomplished *so as by* fire, is one which, as critics have shown from similar language in sacred and profane authors, is effected with difficulty. Amos, the Hebrew Prophet, represents the Jewish nation, who were rescued from imminent danger, ‘as a fire-brand plucked out of the burning.’ Zechariah, in the same spirit and in similar style, characterizes a person who was delivered from impending destruction, as a brand snatched ‘out of the fire.’ Diction of a similar kind, Calmet, Wetstein, and other critics have shown, has been used by Livy, Cicero and Cyprian, for denoting great hazard and difficulty. Paul, in like manner, designed to tell us, that he who should blend vain and useless speculations with the truths of the Gospel; but should rest nevertheless, in the main, on the only basis, would, in the end, be saved; but with the difficulty of a person who should escape with the possession of his life, but with the loss of his property, from an overwhelming conflagration: or, according to Estius, like the merchant, who should gain the shore with the destruction of his goods, but the preservation of his life, from the tempest of the sea.”

Finally, the Apostle teaches that the purifying test which is like, or as by fire, affects, or passes upon, the doctrine and not the person. His "work," if it stand not the test, "shall be burned." The trial, therefore, is not of persons in purgatory or anywhere else, in the sense of Rome, but of works. They shall suffer loss, not purgatorial pains, the loss of all their works, but themselves shall be saved. But let it ever be remembered, if they *build on Christ*.

This passage, therefore, does not, in any sense, sustain the doctrine of purgatory, as held by the Church of Rome: a *purgatory* that *tries* the *agent*, not the *action*, the *worker*, not the *works*, and *saves*, not "*so us*," but *by fire*.

Some of the advocates of this doctrine fully rely on the language of St. Peter, iii. chap., first letter, 18-20th verses, as demonstrating its truth. And this is the last text, worthy of note, brought forward to sustain this dogma. The English version reads thus :

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God ; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit : By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison ; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing, wherein few, that is eight, souls were saved by water."

Dr. Clarke, on the phrase, "By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison," which, he thinks, is not a correct translation, makes the following critical remarks :

"On this word there are several various readings ; some of the Greek MSS. read *πνευματι*, *in spirit*, and one *πνευματι Ἀγιῳ*,

in the *Holy Spirit*. I have before me one of the first, if not the very first edition of the *Latin Bible* : and, in it, the verse stands thus : *In quo et his, qui in carcere erant SPIRITUALITER veniens prædicavit* ; by which he came *spiritually*, and preached to them that were in prison ?

“ In two very ancient MSS. of the Vulgate before me, the clause is thus : *In quo et his qui in carcere erant SPIRITU venient prædicavit* ; in which, coming *by the Spirit*, he preached to those who were in prison ? This is the reading, also, in the *Complutensian Polyglot*.

“ Another ancient MS. in my possession, has the words nearly as in the printed copy : *In quo et his qui in carcere CONCLUSI erant Spiritualiter veniens prædicavit* ; in which, coming *spiritually*, he preached to those who were SHUT UP in prison ?

“ Another MS., written about A. D. 1370, is the same as the printed copy.

“ The common *printed Vulgate* is different from all these, and from all the MS. of the Vulgate which I have seen, in reading *spiritibus*, ‘ to the spirits.’ ”

But if we admit—which, from the above criticism, is more than doubtful—that the edition of the Vulgate, admitted to be genuine by the Romish Church, and our common English version, give the Greek, and the precise idea of St. Peter, correctly—“ *he went and preached unto the spirits in prison* ”—still, this does not prove that there is a purgatory. A simple analysis and common sense criticism, I doubt not, will clearly show this.

Christ, says Peter, was “ put to death in the flesh, but *quickened by the Spirit*.” By what Spirit ? His own spirit ? Nay, not by his human spirit, but “ *by THE SPIRIT* ;” the Spirit, then, clearly the Holy Ghost, by whom he was conceived, and by whom he was anointed at Jordan ; the Spirit that *inspired* the prophets, and who *strove* with the antediluvians—“ *By* ”

not in "*which*"—*Spirit*—"also *He* went and preached unto the spirits"—living men—"in prison"—in the body; "*which* spirits"—in living men—"sometime were disobedient WHEN"—or *while*—"once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a-preparing." Then, while the ark was preparing, it is clear, he preached unto them "*by the Spirit*." In other words, the spirits were disobedient, all must admit—this Peter declares—"while the ark was a-preparing." Noah, all know, was a "*preacher of righteousness*"—God's preacher. The *Spirit*, who quickened and enlightened him, and moved him to preach, *strove with the people*—the disobedient—while Noah preached, and by and through his preaching. Christ, therefore, by his Spirit, through Noah, preached unto them. This cannot be denied; and this, simply, is the doctrine taught in this mystified and much-abused passage. Indeed, this is the only rational exposition of which we can conceive.

If we suppose, as the Trent Catechism teaches, and the Rhemish annotators, and Challoner, and Milner, and others, contend, that purgatory is meant by the term "prison;" then, the wicked antediluvians, whose abominable ungodliness and corruptions have hardly ever been surpassed, were detained in a "middle state"—nay, according to Milner, in "*Abraham's bosom*," "*with other just souls*," till after Christ's death, whence they were liberated by his preaching while disembodied! And yet, they must have died in "*mortal sin*"—a sin which excludes from purgatory and shuts up in hell forever, according to the theology of Rome. How, then, could they be saved by Christ's preaching? And

furthermore, if the ungodly rejecters of the Gospel of that day, who were swept from the earth by the wild waste of waters, for their very wickedness, went to purgatory, and that purgatory Abraham's bosom, where, with Lazarus and other just souls, they were comforted, we, who reject the preaching of papists in this day, need have no fears of their anathemas and of their purgatory. Let them send us to Abraham's bosom, with other just souls, to be comforted!

Nor can we suppose, with the Greek Church and theologians, that hell is meant by the term "prison." Christ preached the Gospel *by His spirit*, "unto the spirits" there. And for what purpose would he preach the Gospel to disembodied souls hopelessly lost? The idea is revoltingly absurd.

We are thrown back, then, upon the exposition I have given as the only rational, tenable one.

The "*judicious* Calmet," as Dr. Clarke calls him, who firmly holds the doctrine of purgatory as, and because, it is taught by his Church, doubts that it receives any support from this passage. Bellarmine, who quotes nineteen texts to sustain this dogma, rejects this one. Alexander, also, after bringing to the support of this superstition every sentence which learning and ingenuity could marshal in its support and defence, rejects this one altogether. Not a single Father ever expounded the passage to mean the Romish purgatory. They, however, knew nothing about this doctrine. The moderns are more wise.

The doctrine of purgatory, then, is without Scriptural foundation, and is purely a "human invention"—a doctrine, indeed, of "seducing spirits."

"Many distinguished theologians of Rome have, with laudable candor, admitted the silence of Revelation on this topic : and among the rest, Barns, Bruys, Courayer, Alphonsus, Fisher, Polydorus, Goto, Perionius, Picherel, Wicolijs, Cajetan, and Trevern. Barns declares 'purgatorial punishment a matter of human opinion, which can be evinced neither from Scripture, Fathers, nor Councils.' Bruys says, 'it was unknown to the Apostles and original Christians.' Alphonsus, Fisher, and Polydorus, 'grant the total omission or rare mention of this tenet in the monuments of antiquity.' Cajetan and others admit the same."

"Bellarmine and Alexander, the two celebrated advocates of this theology, have, between them, rejected all its Scriptural proofs, and agree only in one apocryphal argument."*

The primitive Church knew nothing of this doctrine. For hundreds of years every Father, with one exception *perhaps*, who wrote on future rewards and punishments, rejected all thought of a middle state of purgation. Clemens, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Augustine, and many others, speak of the bliss of heaven and of the anguish of hell, but ignore altogether the purgatory of Rome; or if they allude to the theory of a middle state at all, it is in the clear, expressive language of Augustine, who says:

"The idea of a third place is unknown to the Church and foreign to the Sacred Scriptures;" and of Chrysostom, who affirms that, 'When we shall be departed out of this life, there is then no room for repentance; nor will it be in our power to *wash out any spots* we have contracted, or to *purge away one of the evils* we have committed."

But this doctrine is not only without Scriptural authority and early traditional support, it is in conflict with both. The Fathers, as we have seen, emphatically

* Edgar's Variations.

deny the existence of a middle state of purgation. They, however, were but mere men. I only appeal to them and to tradition to meet and refute Rome on her own chosen ground. The Bible is the only source and rule of faith. To that we must ultimately appeal every question. In its pages but two places of departed spirits are revealed to us—heaven and hell. They are the abodes of the righteous and of the wicked, whose states are forever unalterably, changelessly fixed. A great gulph sweeps between them, across which none can ever pass.

Abraham's bosom and *Paradise* are terms denoting happiness, nothing but happiness; and they give no intimation as to the *place* or *locality* of that happiness. There is no such place as Abraham's bosom, *as a local habitation*. It is a *figurative* term, meaning repose, bliss. So is Paradise.* To make one a place, we must the other also, and then there would be *two* middle states, or *abodes*, for the righteous. "But," it is replied, "they both mean the same thing." So they do; they mean happiness, nothing but happiness, and leave other passages to reveal the *place* where that happiness is to be enjoyed, and that place is heaven.

The plan of this work and time and space do not allow me to enter fully into the discussion of this interesting theme. A few brief reflections are all that I can throw out.

When the dying malefactor turned his penitent heart to the expiring Son of God, as both hung on their

* Dr. Clarke, in a very able criticism, shows this. He says: "The *state of the blessed* is certainly what our Lord here means; in what the *locality* of that state consists, we know not." Yes we do: it is heaven.

crosses in unutterable agony, the Saviour said: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." After his resurrection, he said to Mary: "Touch *me* not; *I* am not yet ascended to my Father." Out of these two sentences, a middle state, or more properly, place this side of heaven, has been manufactured.

Touch me not; *I* am not yet ascended, &c. The pronouns *me* and *I*, have reference to the entire manhood of Christ—*body* and *soul*, especially to his body. The circumstances, and the word touch, or cling, as the Greek imports, prove this beyond all peradventure. The Saviour, therefore, meant, and only meant, as I can conceive, that, in his risen state, or with his body, he had not ascended to his Father. The word ascend conveys no other idea. He did not intimate, therefore, *where* His spirit had been between the crucifixion and the resurrection. He had been to Paradise, we know, to bliss; and I undoubtingly believe, to God. Paradise means delight, bliss; and the *place where it is realized is heaven*. His body had not been there; for it was just risen. He meant no more.

When Stephen was stoned to death, he saw heaven opened, "and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God." He cried out, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" Did he go to Jesus and that glory which ravished his dying eyes, or stop this side, at a middle place? The former is the only reasonable inference?

Paul, amid the toils and afflictions of his ministry, as scenes of fadeless glory filled his vision and attracted him away to his Father's house, exclaimed: "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart

and *be with Christ*; nevertheless, it is needful for you that I remain." The intense desire of his heart was to *be with Christ*, and this, no doubt, has long since been realized. *He is with Christ to-day, and Christ is with God.*

When Jesus was transfigured on "the holy mount," Moses and Elias came and talked with him. *Elias* had been *translated*, and taken to heaven, beyond the intermediate place, *if* there be one. *Moses* was a *disembodied spirit*, and therefore, according to this theory, had never seen heaven; and, according to Rome, was an inhabitant of, and a sufferer in, purgatory!! But they both came together, talked together with Jesus, and were, as radiant figures, happy—happy, in the midst of the same bright glory; and passed away together. Now, did *Elias* come by Paradise, or purgatory, and take *Moses* into his fiery chariot, and then as he returned leave him there? Who can imagine so for a single moment? It is an idea, a shadowy something, rather, nothing, that I never can grasp. No, no! There is no middle place beyond earth. "Three abodes there are under the government of Almighty God: the first is heaven; second, hell; third, this world. In hell none are good, in heaven none bad, and both are supplied from the middle, in which are both good and bad. The servants of God, go to God, and the servants of the devil, and a host of others, to the devil."* *St. Ambrose*, and *Gregory the Great*, teach the same doctrine. *Infallible Gregory*, however, at times doubted.

The description of the place, and of the sufferings of the rich man, shows that he was in, and suffering the

* *St. Patrick*, quoted by *Ousley*.

very pains of, hell. And if there is no middle place for the wicked there is none for the righteous. The language of Paul, of the "wood, hay, stubble," which shall be burned with fire, and of Peter of "the spirits in prison," or "descent into hell," as it has been very improperly called, as I have shown, have no reference to a middle state of any kind. Where, then, is it found?

Now in the face of texts, and facts, and reasons, wholly irreconcilable with the dogma of a middle state, shall we hold to this momentous doctrine, supported as it is only by a single expression of our Saviour: "I am not yet ascended to my Father;" an expression that had reference primarily, if not exclusively, to his body? I may stand alone, but I reject the doctrine of a *middle place* or *locality* altogether.

But, if I were to admit that there is a middle world, or locality, every text that is supposed to refer to it, save the one concerning the rich man, demonstrates that it is a place of repose, of delight, of happiness, and not of suffering and purgation. Not only this, but that none go to that place but the pure. And hence it cannot be the purgatory of Rome.

The doctrine of purgatory substitutes the *merit of suffering* for the *merits of Christ*.

Dr. Challoner, in his Catholic Christian, says:

"An indulgence is the releasing a true penitent from the debt of temporal punishment due to sin, which punishment the penitent must either discharge by way of *satisfaction* and *penance here, or suffer in proportion to his debt.*"

Bellarmino, Alexander, Milner, and, indeed, all who have alluded to the nature and benefits of purgatory, teach that it is a place of atonement and purification

by suffering. This the very name imports. The *atonement*, the *satisfaction*, offered to God, is *suffering*. Indulgences, however, and the suffrages of the faithful, and the acceptable sacrifice of the mass, it is proclaimed, as we have seen, will redeem and release from its penal fire and atoning sufferings. But if the poor soul has left none on earth with the will, or ability to purchase an indulgence, or buy a mass for him, and the faithful do not offer up their suffrages, he must endure all the punishment due for his crimes—must “suffer in proportion to his debt.” But the suffering will expiate and the fires purify at length, and he will come out redeemed and disenthralled.

Now, to ask if all this is not in conflict with the Gospel plan of salvation, and the clear teachings of Him who has brought life and immortality to light, would almost be an insult to common sense. The offering up of Jesus Christ on the cross once for all, God teaches, is the only sacrifice for sin; and his blood once freely shed for us, the only means to purify and save. “He hath once *suffered* for *sins*, the *just* for the *unjust*, that *He* might *bring us to God*.” The *blood* of *Jesus Christ* *cleanseth from all sin*.” Unto *Him* who loved us and *washed us from our sins in his own blood*.” “For by *one offering* He hath *perfected* forever them that are sanctified.” “And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now, where *remission of these* is, there is no more offering,” or atonement, “for sin.” No more is needed, is clearly the Apostle’s meaning. “Sins and iniquities” being “remitted,” the punishment due to them is remitted also, and hence “no more offering” is required. Purgatorial expiation, then, the

merit of suffering, lays another foundation than that is laid—Jesus Christ, and subverts the ever-blessed Gospel of the grace of God.

To escape this difficulty, we are gravely told that the atonement of Christ procures for us the sufferings and expiation of purgatory, to save us from a hell of unutterable and eternal anguish; that the atonement of purgatory was procured by the atonement of Christ. We are saved by Christ through the sufferings of purgatory! Whence know they this? A doctrine so important, we can but believe, would, at least, have been *insinuated* in the Gospel, but this is not the case. Infallible Mother Church, however, supplies the omission and reveals it to the world.

But, first, if the atonement of Christ could not procure our full redemption from all the penalties of law, but purchased purgatorial suffering, to what end is that suffering? It must be meritorious, or an unreasonable, profitless cruelty. Besides, Bellarmine, Alexander, Challoner, and many others, teach, if we can understand the meaning of language, that the suffering is expiatory; and hence it must, say what you will, super-add merit to the blood of Christ. Or another foundation is laid for the salvation of the soul, other than that laid by Him.

In the next place, the same writers and Councils teach that indulgences, the suffrages of the faithful, and the acceptable sacrifice of the mass, deliver the soul at once from purgatory. And when we ask, will they deliver from its sufferings, by their own *intrinsic, natural merits*? we are assured they will not; that all the merits *they* have are of the institution of Christ through

His blood. The atonement of Christ, therefore, *through indulgences, &c.*, does save from purgatory, without the payment of the "debt due to sin," by suffering; or infallible Church is in error. Why, then, cannot and does not the blood of Christ save, without either indulgences or suffering, if *they* only save *through* the merit they have derived from the atonement? Why? The infallible oracle is dumb. But the glorious Gospel, in clear, joyous tones, answers in emphatic language that the blood of Christ can and does save from sin, and all the penalties or punishments due to sin, without indulgences, or the sacrifice of the mass, or purgatorial sufferings.

The position, therefore, that this doctrine lays another foundation than that which was laid by Jesus Christ, is not only not shaken by this objection, but strengthened and sustained. Purgatory, then, like transubstantiation, is not only a departure from the faith, but eternally irreconcilable with it. *It is another Gospel.*

This doctrine is in conflict with *penance, indulgences, the sacrifice of the Mass, and extreme unction.* It is wholly unnecessary, or *they* have utterly failed to confer the benefits promised. It will be remembered, that we are distinctly taught that "penance is a sacrament;" that that sacrament consists in the words of the priest: "I absolve thee." Sacraments, we are also taught, "confer grace"—"*ex opere operato.*" The sinner, therefore, receiving absolution, must—can but receive grace, the grace of *remission*, whatever may be the feelings of his mind. Indulgences, we are assured, "remit the temporal punishment due to sin, and make the soul white as snow." The "holy eucharist," or "mass,"

is a "sacrifice for sin," "for the living and the dead; because Christ is therein contained, body, soul and divinity, and *unbloodily immolated*, who once offered himself *bloodily* on the cross."* He, therefore, for whom the sacrifice is offered, must realize its merits; and then, in eating the body, and drinking the blood, and masticating the divinity, thus offered up, and given for and to him, he is made necessarily "a partaker of the divine nature." Extreme unction is "a sacrament," and "if any shall say that the holy anointing of the sick doth not *remit sins* and impart grace, let him be accursed." Now, if all this be true, the departing soul passes away into eternity, and stands in the presence of its final Judge, with all its sins remitted, with all the temporal punishment due to sin forever cancelled, with a nature assimilated to the nature of God, and filled and imbued with all the graces which the Holy Roman Catholic Church can confer, and crowned with all her favors and blessings; and yet, in glorious consistency, Mother Church teaches that it must go to purgatory; to pay, by its own suffering, the temporal punishment due to sin! Or thence come out by indulgences, &c., which could not save from that place! Now, these doctrines are false, all false, and a cheat; or purgatory is an imaginary place, which exists only in the brain of a papist. And if one is imaginary, or false, the inevitable consequence is, from Rome's own premises, that all are.

But the question may be asked by the uninitiated—and Roman Catholics, and priests, in certain quarters, have tried to make a different impression: Do souls

* Decree of the Council of Trent.

who have enjoyed all the benefits of penance, indulgences, transubstantiation, and extreme unction, go to purgatory? So Popes, Councils, and theologians teach. All, some theologians most distinctly aver, must pass through the penal fires of that middle world! Even the immaculate Mary herself, Queen of Heaven, we are taught, had to pass through the cleansing ordeal to her seat at the right hand of her Son.* Besides, when his holiness Pope Gregory XVI. died, not a dozen years ago, "masses were said and prayers offered up" throughout the Roman Catholic world, "for the repose of his soul." He was "infallible," so the Ultramontanists unblushingly affirm; he was the earthly head and source of all grace—nay, above God, for he could create Him; he enjoyed through a long life the sacraments of penance and of the holy eucharist; he was the fountain of indulgences—"the treasures of God's grace;" and he was soothed and blessed in his dying hour with the sacrament of extreme unction—the sacerdotal thumb of attendant cardinals anointed him, with holy oil, on the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, feet, and loins, with the sacred sign of the cross; and yet he went to purgatory. So his present holiness, Pius IX. taught, who ordered masses for the repose of his soul. What hope, then, is there, for cardinals, bishops, priests, people, that they will ever escape its sufferings; that they will enter heaven without passing through its fearful flames? The faithful here, and a priest there, may deny that those who receive the sacraments, and realize their full benefits, and have procured a plenary indulgence, will have to pass

* A few writers say that the fully sanctified go to heaven.

through the fires of purgatory, but their denial is in conflict with the doctrine of their Church.

If, then, penance, plenary indulgences, the sacrament of the mass, and extreme unction, fail to save *from* purgatory, how can they save *out* of it? If, while the faithful live, and when they die, these means of grace cannot purify and save, by what rule of logic or law of ethics, or invention of Rome, can they bring out of that burning prison? If they failed before, will they not fail now? Having no power, no efficacy, to save from the middle state of purgation, and having no more efficacy now than they had then, common sense teaches that they cannot bring one soul out of it. The soul, then, must suffer till it pays the debt.

To such inextricable difficulties, to such superlative nonsense, to such absurd errors, do the teachings of this fallen Church conduct us !

Finally, the doctrine of purgatory perpetuates the power of the priest over the soul, and its destiny in eternity.

To the faithful, from their cradle to their grave, the priest, as we have seen, by Divine appointment it is true, he professes, is the only channel of grace; the only visible, known medium and agent, through and by whom they can be saved. He is the keeper and lord of their consciences and souls. He stands as a daysman between offended Deity and offending man; and offers sacrifices to one, and absolution to the other. And when the pilgrimage of life is over, and the spirit has gone to its *middle home*—from which, all that he could do, it could not be saved—he still stands between it and God; and by granting indulgences to surviving

relatives, offering the acceptable sacrifice of the mass, he can bring it hence, and send it rejoicing up to bliss immortal! Hence he is looked to and besought by weeping, heart-broken kindred, to interpose his authority and wonderful prerogatives to rescue the poor soul from its sufferings, and give it a passport to heaven.

“In Ireland,” says Rev. Dr. Murray, “the custom of the priest is, at a certain point in the service of the mass, to turn his back to the altar and his face to the people, and to read a long list of the names of deceased persons whose souls are in purgatory, and to offer up a prayer for their deliverance from it. This is done, or used to be done, in the chapels on every Sabbath. To obtain the name of a deceased relative on that magic list, the priest must be paid so much a year, varying, I believe, with the ability of the friends to pay. If the yearly payment is not made when due, the name of the person is erased from the list. A circumstance arising out of this custom, occurring in my boyhood, is distinctly before me: A respectable man in our parish died in middle life, leaving a widow and a large family of children to mourn his loss. True to her religious principles, and to her generous instincts, the widow had her husband’s name placed on that list, and heard, with pious gratitude, his name read over from Sabbath to Sabbath, with a prayer offered for the deliverance of his soul from purgatory. After the lapse of two or three years, on a certain Sabbath, the name of her husband was omitted from the list. The fact filled her with mingled joy and fear; joy, thinking that her husband had escaped from purgatory; and fear, lest she had done something to offend the priest. On timid inquiry, she learned that his soul was yet in purgatory, but that she had forgotten to send in the yearly tax at the time it was due. The tax was promptly paid, and the name was restored on the next Sabbath. With this fact I am entirely conversant; for that widow was my own mother, who sought the release of the soul of my father from purgatory.”*

* Letters to Bishop, now Archbishop Hughes.

Now, *the money* must have brought souls out of purgatory there, and not prayers and masses, or how avaricious and cruel that priest! And how cruel the Church! according to her own doctrine; she might depopulate that habitation of anguish and despair, and send its liberated millions, with rapturous hosannas and songs of grateful praise to Popes, and prelates, and priests, up to "the palace of Angels and God." Why does she not do it? She has the power, she affirms—is money wanting? Does *that* save? or move her to save?

"The doctrine of purgatory is most adroitly calculated to secure an irresistible influence over an ignorant and superstitious people. Only let it be believed, that the soul is exquisitely tormented in a fire, from which the celebration of masses can deliver it, and the priest has at once a strong rein upon the necks of surviving relatives and friends, and a sure key to their pockets. Accordingly, masses for souls in purgatory have always been a most gainful trade to the Church of Rome. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Council commands that the existence of purgatory be believed, held, taught, and everywhere preached."*

But God never gave to His Apostles, nor to His Church—much less has He given to Roman Catholic priests—power over souls in eternity; nor committed to them, in any way, or sense, means of grace to affect them there. The doctrine of purgatory, therefore, I would say once again, is of human invention—a foundation never laid by Jesus Christ.

We have thus briefly examined—briefly for the momentous interest involved in them—the doctrines of Infallibility, Auricular Confession, Priestly Absolution and Indulgences, Transubstantiation, Extreme Unction,

* Master-Key to Popery.

and Purgatory, as held by the Church of Rome, and to what conclusion are we irresistibly, infallibly conducted? That she is the "falling away" predicted by St. Paul, the GREAT APOSTASY. In each and all she has "departed from the faith," and has, therefore, ceased—long since ceased—to be a Church of Christ. She is of God rejected, and is verily, truly, the ANTI-CHRIST.

Here, then, may we pause—pause, and wonder at the varied and profound errors which, in the teachings of a Church professing infallibility, have accumulated around the cross of Christ, obscuring its glory, and shutting up the way to heaven and to the tree of life—pause, and leave the good Romanist in purgatory, whence, in due time, he may come out, *by indulgences*, or *by the suffrages of the faithful*, or *by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar*, or *by his own sufferings*; and I defy the divines of Rome to tell which—from him who now wears the tiara and sitteth in the Temple of God, down to the boy-priest of Maynooth ordained to-day.

CHAPTER IV.

PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Practice is a test of doctrine. The Divine Redeemer has taught: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." Obedience, therefore, to a command, or the practice of a dogma, demonstrates its origin, its truth or falsehood, and its adaptation to accomplish the end proposed. Hence, in the practical workings of any system, or doctrine, we "know whether it is of God." As the stream reveals the fountain, so the life makes manifest the doctrine.

The inductive philosophy of Bacon teaches the same lesson, and, I may add, demonstrates its truth.

The Great Teacher has also declared, that "The tree is known by his fruit." For "every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." "Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them." What, then, are the fruits of Romanism? What evidence does her practice give, that her doctrines are from God? A thorough examination of the effects of her teachings when reduced to practice, in answer to this question, is the design of this chapter. What, then, is her practice?

The Church of Rome is Idolatrous.

This is a very grave charge, and should not be made without the most indubitable proof. The proof is at hand, clear and abundant.

That Roman Catholics *worship the "host," or bow down unto and adore consecrated bread and wine*, which Mother Church teaches them have been converted into the body and blood of Christ, is frankly admitted; and is known and read of all men. Indeed, all are anathematized who deny the conversion, and will not bow down and adore the new-made Christ.

"This Council (of Trent) teacheth, and openly professes, that in the pure and holy sacrament of the eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, is our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, truly, really and substantially contained, under the appearance of these visible things: nor are these matters self-contradictory, that this our Saviour always sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural manner of existing; and that, notwithstanding he is in many other places sacramentally present to us with his substance, there is therefore no room to doubt but that the faithful of Christ should *adore* his most holy sacrament with that *highest worship due to the true God*, according to the constant usage in the Catholic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored, that it was instituted by Christ our Lord to be *eaten*."

"If any one shall say that this holy sacrament should not be adored, nor solemnly carried about in processions, nor held up publicly to the people to adore it, or that its worshippers are idolaters, let him be accursed."

This is enough. Rome declares that she "*adores*" the "*most holy sacrament with that highest worship due to the true God;*" that this is her "*constant usage;*" that it is "*carried about in processions*" and

"held up publicly to the people to adore it." Now, this is idolatry. It is giving to the *creature*, to *consecrated bread*, but *bread still*, the "highest worship due to the true God." This is the very essence of idolatry.

The teachings of Rome herself is strong evidence that it is idolatry, and would drive me to this belief if I had no other reasons at hand. The God whom she has just created and "adored" she declares she "*eats and inwardly digests*." Now, can Roman Catholics, can any man in his senses, believe that they can "eat and inwardly digest" God? And yet, that which they have eaten, they adored as God!

In the "Missal," or "Mass-Book," we have this language: "Should any priest not *intend* to consecrate, there is *no sacrament*, because *intention* is necessary." And furthermore, "If there be any *defects* in the *matter, form, intention, or minister*, the consecration is null and void."* "Then," it is added, "*Christ is not in the mass*—nothing but mere bread and wine still." Hence Cardinal Bellarmine affirms, that "No man can be certain with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament; because it depends on the minister's intention to consecrate, and none can see another's intention." Now, if converting the bread into the body of Christ depends on all these things; if when any one of them is wanting "nothing but bread remains," and if, consequently, none "can be certain with the certainty of faith" that the conversion has taken place, and that Christ is present and not mere bread—then, none can know certainly that they worship *God*, or *bread*. And if ever a case

* A number of defects that may occur in the form, minister, and matter, are mentioned.

has occurred, in the millions of consecrations, and many have, when "the consecration was null and void," nothing but "mere bread" remaining, the worshippers were guilty, Rome herself being judge, of "*gross idolatry*."

The disciples did not worship the sacrament on the night of its institution, consecrated as it was by Christ himself. Nor did apostles, evangelists, or "the faithful," for hundreds of years, ever bow down before and adore it. The learned Tillotson says, "The doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, was first started about the year 750." Nor was it till the year 1251, that *host-worship* was made an article of faith. Honorius III. decreed that the priest, when the consecration was complete, should "elevate the host," and that the people should prostrate themselves and worship it. And about the year 1220 he directed that on the places in which the "host" was reserved for the sick, these words should be written, "HIC DEUM ADORA." "*Worship God here.*"

The *veneration* paid to the *images* and *relics* of saints by Roman Catholics, and their *bowing down* before them, is idolatry. Ever since the second Council of Nice, in 787, images and relics of saints have been venerated, and, as I shall show, again and again worshipped. Listen at the Trent creed:

"The images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, and of other saints, shall be had, consecrated, retained, and *duly worshipped by kissing them, and with uncovered head bowing down before them and their relics.*"

In the "Rituale Romanum," authorized by Pope

Urban VIII., the following prayer is used in the consecration of images:

“Grant, O God, that whosoever before this image shall diligently and humbly upon his knees worship and honor thy only begotten Son; or the blessed Virgin (according as the image is that is consecrating), or this glorious Apostle, or Martyr, or Confessor, or Virgin, that he may obtain by *his* or *her* merits, and *intercession*, grace in this present life, and eternal glory hereafter.”

The following is quoted from a Catechism for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, by Dr. Butler, published some years ago :

“Q. Why do Catholics kneel before the images of the saints ?

“A. To honor Christ and his saints, whom their images represent.

“Q. Is it proper to show any mark of respect to the crucifix, and the picture of Jesus Christ and his saints ?

“A. Yes : because they relate to Christ, and his saints, being representations and memorials of them.”

“The worship of this picture” (the image of St. Dominic) “has become so famous through all Christendom, that multitudes of people, to the number of a hundred thousand and upwards, flock annually to pay their devotions to it.”*

In the Ara Celi church at Rome, there is a “wooden doll about two feet long,” called, in Italian, “*Bambino*,” “the child.” This image represents the infant Jesus, and is thus described by the Rev. Dr. Murray :

“I entered the little chapel where this image is kept in state, just in time to see his little reverence go through a healing process.” “There were there, kneeling before the altar, three poor women with a sick child. The priest who acted in the affair was going through some ceremony before the altar. Soon he turned to the

* Middleton’s Letter from Rome.

right, and with a solemnity which, because feigned, was laughable, opened a little cradle in which lay the glittering doll. He *prayed over it*; and then, taking it in his hands as if unworthy to touch it, placed it in an upright position on the altar. Here he *prayed over it* again. He then took it in his hands, and touched, with its toe, the head of the sick child, and crossed it with it. He then put its toe to the lips of the child, which was made to kiss it. And then each of the women, who were all the while upon their knees, kissed its foot. * * * * Bambino was put back in his beautiful cradle, and the women withdrew.”*

Now, if all this is not idolatry, the world is not now and never has been cursed with this sin and evil. But to the law and to the testimony. In the twentieth chapter of Exodus we have the ten commandments; the first and second read thus:

“1. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.”

“2. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.”

What is *Bambino* but a graven image of Jesus? And what are the images of which the Trent creed speaks — “of Jesus and the Virgin, and of other saints,” but the likenesses of things that are in heaven above, and in the earth beneath? And what is the image of St. Dominic, to which so many flocked to pay their devotions? And what is the bowing down before

* This doll was recently described by a writer in “The Wilmington Journal.” Its clothes and jewels, he says, cost \$30,000.

these but a direct violation of the command, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them"? Roman Catholics have never denied that they bow down before them. Say they: "We bow down before them to enliven our devotions." "The images bring vividly to our minds the Saviour or saints whom they represent." This was precisely the view that intelligent heathen took of their image-worship. Plato, and Socrates, and Cicero, did not believe that the *image* was the divinity, or god; but that it *represented* him or her. The image brought vividly before the mind the god, his power, his character, his deeds; and Jupiter, or Mars, or Apollo, or Minerva, whose image it was, would hear and answer as the suppliant bowed down before it. If *that* was *idolatry*, so is the *bowing down and praying* before images of saints.

But worse than this, the Roman Catholic Church has *stricken out* the *second command* from nearly all her Catechisms and religious works, published for "the faithful," in their vernacular tongue. Indeed, until since the Reformation, and then, per force of Protestant arguments and influence, the second command was never given to the people for over six hundred years. The tenth commandment was divided into two!

The commandments are thus given by Rev. Dr. Butler in his "Catechism for Ireland; *revised, approved and recommended by the Archbishops*:"*

"Q. Say the ten commandments of God.

"A. 1. I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no strange Gods before me.

"2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

* This was published at Dublin, 1811.

- “ 3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day
- “ 4. Honor thy father and mother.
- “ 5. Thou shalt not kill.
- “ 6. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- “ 7. Thou shalt not steal.
- “ 8. Thou shalt not bear false witness, &c.
- “ 9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.
- “ 10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.”

The second command is left out. What sacrilege! What daring impiety! The children of poor Ireland are not to know that the God who made them proclaims in his holy law, “Thou shalt not bow down thyself to graven images.” “And this mutilated copy of the divine commandments,” says an able writer, “was the *only one* to be found in the manuals of the Romish Church before the Reformation, and even at a later period.” And Bishop Stillingfleet affirms: “I have now before me the *reformed* office of the blessed Virgin, printed at Salamanca, A.D., 1588, published by order of Pius V., where the second command is so left out, and so in the English office at Antwerp, A.D., 1658. I wish,” he adds, “he (the papist) had told us in what public office of their Church it is to be found.”

In the “*Christian's Guide to Heaven*” the second commandment is wholly left out, and the tenth divided into two. A book which mutilates the divine commands, and instructs in, and urges to a practice, emphatically forbidden in the part stricken out, a *guide to heaven*! And that book published under the eye, and with the approbation of one of the chief, and who is said to have been one among the most pious officers of the Church!

In the Douay Catechism, the second command is

blended with the first, and the ninth divided as usual into the ninth and tenth. And this is the only catechism or Roman Catholic work with which I have met, that gives, in any form or connection, the second command; and this, as I shall show, is so erroneously translated, that the meaning is entirely changed. The reasons usually offered by the theologians of Rome for this omission and mutilation are: "It is unnecessary to give the second command, as the first contains what it enjoins; and it is so long, that the memory of the child, being burdened, would not retain it"! Then why did God give it to us? Why publish it, blended with the first, in the Douay Catechism? And why omit it in the "Christian's Guide to Heaven"? a work for mature memories.

But to show that the second command is important, that its very letter clearly, unequivocally prohibits the practice of *bowing down to images*, and that it sorely troubles the teachers in this fallen Church, the Douay Catechism renders the Hebrew thus: "Thou shalt not adore nor worship them." This is a perversion; a pious fraud, which the translator, if he knew anything of Hebrew, must have known. If it be unnecessary, or cannot be remembered, or mean but little, why not render it correctly?

The Hebrew, which is now before me, reads thus: *לֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדָם*. An exact literal translation, just as it stands, is this: "*Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them; thou shalt not serve them.*" About the second clause: "Thou shalt not serve them," there is no dispute. The catechism gives this translation; nor do we allege that Rome serves them. But the first,

as above, the catechism renders, "Thou shalt not *adore* them." Now the word, the verb *שָׁחָה** means to *bow down*; only, and always to *bow down*. It never means *adore*, in all the Bible.

Gesenius, than whom no lexicographer knew better, gives the following meanings: "1. *To bow down, to prostrate oneself in order to do him honor and reverence.* 2. *To bow down before God, to worship.*"

It never did, it never can mean adoration. He who bows may adore in bowing, or when bowed down, but this would be still more fatal to image worship.

Furthermore, this verb as it stands before us written by the finger of God, is in the Hithpael conjugation, which designates *action springing from and terminating in itself or the agent*. Thus, in Genesis xxxiii. 6: *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ*, "*And they bowed down themselves.*" And in 2 Kings, v. 18, in Chaldee: *בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתִי בֵּית רִמְמוֹן*, "*When I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon.*" And in a hundred other chapters. To render, therefore, the verb *שָׁחָה*, "*adore*," is not only an utter perversion of the meaning, but as it stands in this text, is to make nonsense of it. To render it grammatically in Rome's sense, it would read, "*Thou shalt not adore thyself, to them*"! *Thyself* is an integral part of it.

But the word in dispute and its cognates not only always means to bow down, but sometimes carries with it the idea of veneration, of worship, of prayer. In the lxxii. Psalm, the worship of Messiah is simply expressed in these words: "*They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before Him.*" Bowing before Him is submission, veneration, worship. What, then, is bow-

* This is the sure root.

ing before his image, or Bambino, or the image of Mary, etc.?

In the xx. chapter of 1 Kings, 19th verse, the same idea is presented: "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal." Simply bowing the knee unto the image of Baal—for the silver or the wood before them was but the image—*was idolatry*. What is it, then, to bow the knee before the image of St. Dominico, of the Virgin, or of Gregory the Great? Ah, what is it "*duly to worship by kissing them, and with uncovered head to bow down before them*"? Idolatry, nothing but idolatry. Idolatry, the more revolting and damnable, because it is practiced under the name of our holy Christianity.

The *invocation of saints and angels*, and of the *Virgin Mary*, is idolatry. That Roman Catholics *pray to*, or *invoke* saints and the Virgin, is admitted by bishops, priests, and people. Popes and Councils command it. That they pray to them, however, to grant of their own power the favors and blessings for which they ask, they deny. They *pray to the saint to intercede* with the Son, to *intercede* with the Father, to vouchsafe the boon desired! But even this, as I shall show, is both foolishness and idolatry. It is foolishness. Where is the saint? Is he omnipresent? or has he a local habitation? Is he in heaven? or purgatory? or at some place on earth—Rome, Paris, London, New York, Charleston? He *must be at some place, and can only be at that place*, and *absent from all others* at the same time he is there. Now, take a prayer to St. Augustine. The hour for vespers has come. Hundreds of worshippers in the same meridian—London, Paris, Madrid, or Wil-

mington, Richmond, Washington, Albany—are praying to him at the same time. Can he hear them all? Then he is omnipresent—God. If he cannot hear them all, then all of them but one pray to *nothing*,* to intercede with the Son for them! This is Roman Catholic theology. But could he hear, even this would be idolatry. To pay *religious adoration*, in any sense, to the *creature*, is idolatry. To bow down before saints or angels, and *invoke* them as *intercessors* or *mediators*, when God declares that there is but one mediator—Christ Jesus, and ask of them any blessing, is giving the glory of God to another—which is the very essence of idolatry.

The denial that the Church teaches “the faithful” to pray to saints, and especially the Virgin Mary, to grant *of themselves* blessings, and that they do so pray, is Jesuitical. We can understand plain Latin sentences and common English.

In the “Christian’s Guide to Heaven,” now before us, we have, with a great deal more of the same kind, the following directions and prayers:

•
“TO OUR ANGEL GUARDIAN AND ALL THE HOLY ANGELS.

“We should have for our Guardian Angels the highest sentiment of respect, of thanksgiving, of love, and confidence; their dignity, their good offices, and the esteem they have for us, most justly demand this. We should *constantly invoke their assistance*, and *consult them in all we undertake*.”†

* I believe even that one prays to nothing; the saint, if he be a saint is in heaven. How, then, can he hear any one on earth. Suppose now, while I write in my study, I were to fall on my knees and pray to Pius IX., who is in Rome, to intercede with the Son for me, would not people think me insane?

† The italicising is my own. And I would say, once for all, that, in quoting, I frequently italicise, and cannot stop to notice it.

"A PRAYER TO OUR ANGEL GUARDIAN.

"O HOLY Angel! to whose care God in his mercy hath committed me; thou who assistest me in my wants, who consolest me in my afflictions, who supportest me when dejected, and who constantly obtainest for me new favors; I return THEE now most sincere and humble thanks; and conjure thee, O amiable Guide! to continue still thy care; to DEFEND me against my enemies; to REMOVE from me the occasions of sin; to obtain for me a docility to thy holy inspirations; to protect me, in particular, at the hour of my death; and then conduct me to the mansions of eternal repose. Amen."*

If this is not praying to a *creature* to grant of *himself* blessings that God only can vouchsafe; if it is not adoring the creature with the highest adoration due only to Jehovah, I cannot understand the meaning of language. Let the intelligent reader judge.

"A PRAYER TO ST. MICHAEL.

"GLORIOUS St. Michael, Prince of the heavenly host!" "who didst fight with the dragon, the old serpent, and didst cast him out of heaven;" "I earnestly entreat thee to assist me also, in the painful and dangerous conflict which I have to sustain against the same formidable foe."

"A PRAYER TO ST. JOSEPH.†

"O GREAT SAINT! who art the wise and faithful servant whom God hath charged with the care of his family." * * * "Chaste spouse of the mother of God! thou model of pure, humble, and interior souls! be touched with the confidence we have in thee; and graciously accept these testimonies of devotion."

From the prayer, or thanksgiving, in honor of the patron saint of the place where we dwell, as given in the Romish Litany, I take the following sentence:

"And thou great saint! vouchsafe to make us every day experience the powerful effects of thy protection."

* Page 177.

† The husband of Mary.

Who, but a Roman Catholic, could ever use language like this, except to God only?

To St. Augustine, St. Patrick, St. Dominic, &c., &c., petitions are earnestly offered up for *protection, assistance, guidance, favor, deliverance, life*; and devout thanksgivings are poured forth for all these. To quote all, would be, in part, to give a Roman Catholic Prayer Book.

“PRAYER TO THE VIRGIN MARY.†

“We fly to thy patronage, O holy Mother of God! despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all danger, O ever gracious and blessed Virgin”!

“Holy Mary, Mother of Grace, Cause of our Joy, Spiritual Vessel, Ark of the Covenant, Gate of Heaven, Health of the Weak Refuge of Sinners, Comforter of the Afflicted, Help of Christians.”

I have not given the prayer in full—it is unnecessary; it is all of the same kind. Now, surely, such language needs no comment. If this is not giving the glory of God to another, and therefore gross idolatry, I cannot understand in what the giving of the glory of God to another consists. The precepts and commands of the Bible must be *fables*, or a *dead letter*, or the worship of the “Queen of Heaven,” as Mary is frequently termed, and Juno, and Diana, and Minerva, must be idolatry.

In another prayer in the “Office of the Virgin,” we have this language:

“O glorious Virgin,†

Thou art the gate of the great King, and the shining palace of light. Ye redeemed nations, clap your hands, that life is given by a Virgin.”

* “Litany of the Lady of Loretto.”

† See the original, O gloriosa Virginum.

In the prayer commencing, "Serenissima Imperatrix coeli,"* "Most serene Empress of heaven," we have these petitions:

"Incline, O most benignant Mother, the ears of thy kindness to our fervent prayers. Remember, O glorious Mother of God, the glorious things which are spoken of thee and have been done by thee.
* * * * For thou (like Esther) beautiful and fair in the eyes of God, the Most High King, obtainest life eternal for many, who, by their sins, deserved damnation."

In another prayer, the suppliant cries out.

"I beseech thee, O Holy Lady Mary, Mother of God! most full of pity, daughter of the Supreme King—mother most glorious—the consolation of the afflicted—the way of those who go astray—the salvation of all who hope in thee—the fountain of compassion—the fountain of salvation and grace—the fountain of piety and joy—the fountain of life and pardon"!

And in another:

"Incline, O Mother of Mercy, the ears of thy pity to my unworthy supplications, and be pitiful and propitious to me, a very great sinner, and be thou my helper in all things."

If this is not idolatry, idolatry of the worst kind unmasked, let Roman Catholic theologians show in what it differs from the worship of Diana or Minerva. The argument usually offered does not meet the case—that they petition the Saints and Virgin to intercede with the Son for them—for the above are petitions to the Saints and Virgin, to *grant of themselves, grace, pardon, life*, which God only can give. Nor will the plea answer that these prayers have become obsolete—not used in this country, &c. The most of them, I know, are used; all of them have been printed and in use in

* This prayer has never been given in English by a Papist.

the present century, and *Rome*, "the faithful" boast, never changes.*

But not only do Roman Catholics offer prayers and supplications to Mary as a Goddess, they chant her praise in fervid poetic language, and in songs which clearly indicate that she is coequal with the Son.

In the "Guide,"† under the head of

"VESPERS FOR SUNDAYS,"

we have the following:

"HAIL. Mary. Queen of heavenly spheres!
Hail, whom the angelic host reveres!
Hail, fruitful root, hail sacred gate!
Whence the world's light derives its date!
O glorious maid, with beauty blessed!
May joys eternal fill thy breast!"

In connection with this, we have the subjoined, I may call it, poetic prayer:

"Hail, O Queen, O mother of mercy! hail, our life, our comfort, and our hope.

"We, the banished children of Eve, cry unto thee. To thee we send up our sighs, groaning and weeping in this vale of tears.

"Come, then, our advocate! and look upon us with those thy pitying eyes. And after this our banishment, show us Jesus, the blessed fruit of thy womb O merciful! O pious! O sweet Virgin Mary!"

Now, who that had never heard of Mary or of Jesus,

* See the "Encyclical Letter of our most holy Lord Pope Gregory XVI.," published in 1832. "Let us," he says, "lift up our eyes and hands to the most holy Virgin Mary, who *alone* has destroyed all heresies, &c.

† Page 319.

upon hearing such a prayer, would suppose or believe for a single moment, but that Mary is a Goddess, and superior to Jesus. The prayer is made directly to her. She is "Queen, mother of mercy; our life, comfort, hope!" To her the needy "cry" is "sent up," and every "sigh" extorted by suffering in this "vale of tears:" and Jesus is the "fruit of her womb," whom *she* will show—to whom conduct in heaven.

That Jesus was the fruit, or offspring, of Mary *in his human nature*, is clearly revealed to us; but, in his Divine nature, he was her Creator; and as infinitely above her as above men, or the reader. If she ought to be adored because she gave being, under the Providence of God, to his human nature, then, for the same reason, His grandfather, after the flesh, and David, and all in that line, ought to be adored also. If blood relationship to Him *deifies*, then *all* were deities. I would suggest, therefore, that Rome put in her calendar of Gods and Goddesses, all the ancestry of Jesus. Luke gives us the male line. And, as the Church receives "new light," according to her doctrine of infallibility, she can soon make out the female line! Mary was but a woman, possessing our common fallen humanity, the depravity "naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam;" whence, then, her divinity or even immaculateness? There is no intimation of either in the Scriptures, but the contrary. Besides, the Saviour clearly teaches, that spiritual relations are above natural, and that "whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is his mother, his sister, his brother." But the tendency of Rome is ever to the sensible, the tangible, the material.

In the hymn,

“THE PLAINT OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN,”

salvation is ascribed more to the tears and mental anguish of Mary, when her Son died, than to the blood he shed, which only cleanseth from sin. I give several stanzas, just as I find them in the “Guide:”

“Under the world’s redeeming wood
The most afflicted mother stood,
Mingling her tears with her Son’s blood.

“As that stream’d down from ev’ry part,
Of all his wounds she felt the smart;
What pierc’d his body, pierc’d her heart.

“Who can with tearless eyes look on,
When such a Mother, such a Son,
Wounded and gasping, does bemoan?

“Oh! worse than Jewish heart that could,
Unmoved, see the double flood,
Of Mary’s tears, and Jesus’ blood!

* * * *

“Ah! pious mother, teach my heart,
Of sighs and tears the holy art,
And in thy grief to bear a part.

“That sword of grief, that did pass through
Thy very soul, O! may it now
One kind wound on my heart bestow!

“Great Queen of sorrows! in thy train
Let me a mourner’s place obtain,
With tears to cleanse all sinful stain.

“Refuge of sinners! grant that we
May tread thy steps; and let it be
Our sorrows, not to grieve like thee.

* * *

“ Now give us sorrow, give us love,
That, so prepar'd, we may remove
When call'd to the bless'd seats above !”

I will give but two more ; and complete just as they stand, on page 341 :

“ HYMN TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

“ Hail, Mary ! Queen and Virgin pure,
With every grace replete !
Hail, kind protectress of the poor !
Pity our needy state.

“ O thou ! who fillest the highest place,
Next heaven's imperial throne !
Obtain for us each saving grace,
And make our wants thy own.

“ How oft when trouble fill'd my breast,
Or sin my conscience pain'd,
Through thee I sought for peace and rest,
Through thee, I peace obtained.

“ Then hence, in all my pains and cares,
I'll seek for help in thee ;
E'er trusting through thy powerful prayers,
To gain eternity !”

“ ANOTHER.

“ O, Holy Mother of our God !
To thee for help we fly :
Despise not this our humble pray'r,
But all our wants supply.

“ O glorious Virgin, ever blest !
Defend us from our foes ;
From threatening dangers set us free,
And terminate our woes.”

In these two hymns, every word of which is emphatic, the name of Christ does not once appear; nor is there any allusion to the Scriptural and only true doctrine of salvation through his blood. "*Intercession*," "*grace*," "*rest*," "*help*," *eternal* "*gain*," are all ascribed to Mary, "*Mother of God!*" She, not Christ, "*is all in all.*" Compare the inspired Psalms of David, or the pure, lofty, orthodox strains of Watts or Charles Wesley with them, and how wide the difference! David poured out his soul to God as his only Saviour; then in joyous, heavenly strains, praised him as his deliverer. And then, that the world might know whom he loved, whom he adored, and whose he was, with a full heart in ecstasy he exclaimed:

"Whom have I in heaven *but Thee?*

And there is none upon earth I desire beside Thee!"

Watts in his hymn, which has been poured forth by ten thousand times ten thousand tongues, and will be till time shall be no more:—

"Alas! and did my Saviour bleed?"

And Wesley in

"Depth of mercy! can there be?"

And

"Come, O thou traveller unknown!"

And indeed in all their hymns sing of Jesus, look to Jesus, ascribe their salvation, their all, to Jesus, and soar away and mingle their rapturous song of redeeming love with the millions before the throne, as they weave upon the wires of their golden harps the immortal strain: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us

from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father—to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever!”

The evidence, then, is complete, the proof perfectly indubitable, that the Church of Rome is idolatrous. She “adores” the “host,” “with that highest worship due to the true God,” and this is her “constant usage.” “The images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, and of other saints,” she “consecrates, and retains, and duly worships by kissing them, and with uncovered head bowing down before them,” in open violation of the second command, which she has stricken from the sacred decalogue, or in the one or two instances where she has suffered it to remain, has changed its meaning and position. She worships saints, angels, and the Virgin Mary. She *prays* to, *invokes*, and *adores* them, as if they were omnipresent, and almighty to give. The Virgin Mary especially is addressed as a Goddess, Queen of Heaven; is invoked—adored—blessings sought at her hand, which God only can give—the gratitude of the heart poured out to her, and her praises as a deliverer celebrated in lofty strains of prose and poetry.

If all this does not demonstrate that Rome is idolatrous, there is an end of moral reasoning—no dogma, no fact, the nature of no practice, can be established by facts and reasoning.

The Church of Rome is Intolerant.

She declares that she holds the only *true faith*, and that her *practice* is *primitive* and *Apostolic*. This she has a right to do, if done with a proper spirit. This prerogative belongs inherently to every man and all

men. All have a right, under God, (I speak in reference to relative rights among men,) to hold whatever faith they choose, and to practice whatever religious ceremonies, or worship as they chose, if not in contravention of the rights of others. But none have a right—any kind of right—to anathematize others for not holding the same faith and practice. The prerogative of anathematizing belongs to God, and God only. "*Vengeance is MINE; I will repay saith the Lord.*"* He has never delegated this to any man or Church. Hence, while Pius IX. has a right, so far as all other men are concerned, to believe in priestly absolution and transubstantiation, I have an equal right to believe that none can forgive sins but God only, and that Christ is present only in the holy eucharist figuratively, spiritually—and he has no right to anathematize me: I have no right to anathematize him. The assumption, therefore, of such a prerogative is an assumption of a prerogative of God, and is in violation of the meek, forbearing spirit of Jesus; the teachings and practice of the Apostles, and of the laws of civil and religious liberty, and is therefore a damning sin. To this view Rome heartily assents, where she is weak and desires to worm her way into favor; but where she is in the ascendant, or the established Church of the realm, she insultingly rejects it. In these United States, until she became strong, she prated of freedom of conscience; in Italy, Spain, Austria, &c., she spurns it and is intolerant.

If intolerant in Italy, and elsewhere, where she has

* Michael dared not bring a railing accusation against the Devil. Said he: "The Lord rebuke thee." Jude, 9 v.

power, she ought to be met, in her assumptions and aggressions in this land of freedom, with a proper, faithful spirit of opposition. Nor is this opposition intolerance. Else, Luther was intolerant when he preached against her corruptions and tyrannical power, and trampled her anathemas under his feet, and proclaimed the freedom of the human mind. Else, our sires of '76 were intolerant when they hurled back the thunders of George III., and declared that they of right ought to be free. Tolerance, or, to change the phrase a little, the inherent, natural right of every man to enjoy civil and religious freedom unmolested by the tyranny and anathemas of all others, must necessarily, to *sustain itself, oppose intolerance*. Self-defence is not only "the first law of nature," but the imperative duty of every man. This is the very essence of civil and religious liberty. When man or any body of men, under the name of Church or State, assume to lord it over others, and make all bow down before them and believe as they dictate, or crush them to the earth and destroy with fagot and flame, they violate the laws of God and man, and must be resisted. This the Roman Catholic Church does. This is the "falling away" from Apostolic precept and practice with which I charge her.

Nearly every article of her faith she enforces with an anathema. If any man believe it not, or deny it, her intolerant sentence is, "*Let him be accursed*"! Nor is this empty declamation. It is the fearful penalty one pays for the rejection of that which his head and heart cannot approve; a penalty which Rome never fails to inflict when and where she has power. The doctrine may be in conflict with the pure rule of faith which

God has given us: it may be absurd and lead to idolatry and sin, as transubstantiation: still it must be believed and practiced, upon the pain of eternal damnation!

The following excommunication "is to be diligently studied by the clergy, and to be solemnly published in the Churches once a year, or oftener, and carefully taught the people":*

"We *excommunicate* and *anathematize*, in the name of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, all Wickliffites, Hussites, Lutherans, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, and all other heretics, by whatsoever name they are called and of whatsoever sect they be; and also all schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves, or recede obstinately from the obedience of Rome; as also their adherents, receivers, favorers, and generally, any defenders of them: together with all who, without the authority of the Apostolic See, shall knowingly read, keep, or print any of their books which treat on religion, or by or for any cause whatever, publicly or privately, on any pretence whatever defend them."

Give that Church the power, or let her gain the ascendancy, whose priests and people are imbued with the spirit of this anathema, and civil and religious liberty are at an end.

Richerius,† a Roman Catholic writer, says:

"Pope Gregory VII., contrary to the custom used in the Church for more than a thousand years, introduced that order: 'That all bishops must swear unlimited fidelity and obedience to the Pope.'"

The following is the oath:

"I, N—— N——, Bishop elect of the See of N——, do swear, that from this time henceforth I will be faithful and obedient

* 63d Constitution of Paul V.

† Dr. of the Sorbonne

to the blessed Apostle Peter, to the Holy Church of Rome, and to our lord the Pope, and his successors canonically appointed. I will, to my utmost, defend, increase, and advance the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope, and of his successors aforesaid. I will not join in any consultation, act, or treaty, in which anything shall be plotted to the injury of the rights, honor, state, and power of our lord the Pope, or of the said Church. I will keep with all my might the rules of the holy fathers, (decrees of Councils,) the apostolical decrees, ordinances, disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, and cause them to be observed by all others under my jurisdiction."*

"Heretics, schismatics and rebels to our said lord the Pope, and his successors aforesaid, I will, to the utmost of my power, PERSECUTE AND DESTROY."

Every priest takes a similar oath.

The oath of the Jesuit, as Jesuitism does in every thing, transcends in intolerance and wickedness all others. This oath came to light in the celebrated trial of Father Lavelatte, in Paris, in the year 1761, when the "Constitutions" of the Society and other holy things! were dragged from the secret Councils of iniquity. The existence of such an oath, that the Jesuits take this oath, indeed that they take any oath, has been denied in this country. But as well might the Jesuits deny that Loyola ever lived, or that there ever was an Order of Jesuits. Here is the oath :

"I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the holy Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul,† and

* Ousley, p. 389. This oath is given by other Roman Catholic and Protestant writers.

† Are they omnipresent? If not, how do they know they are present?

all the saints and sacred hosts of heaven, and to you my ghostly fathers, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his Holiness, Pope———, is Christ's Vicar General, and is the true and only Head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth: and that by virtue of the Keys of binding and loosing given to his Holiness by my Saviour, Jesus Christ, *he hath power to depose heretical Kings, Princes, States, Commonwealths, and Governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed*: Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his Holiness' rights and customs, against all usurpers of the heretical (Protestant) authority whatsoever: especially against the now-pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred Mother Church of Rome. *I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical King, Prince or State named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers.* I do further declare that the doctrine of the Church of England, the Calvinists, Huguenots, and others of the name Protestant, to be *damnable*, and they themselves are *damned* and to be *damned*, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of his Holiness' agents in any place wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland and Ireland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to, *and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant's doctrine*, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal or otherwise.* I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical, for the propagating of the Mother Church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' councils, from time to time, as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or in any circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father, or any of this sacred convent. All which I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed Sacrament, which I am now to receive,

* The Jesuit is an enemy of, and traitor to any Protestant Government in which he may live. And yet they are welcomed to these shores.

to perform, and on my part to keep inviolably ; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist ; and witness the same with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent, this ——— day of ——— Anno Domini ———."

An edition of the Douay Bible was published, with notes, at Dublin, in 1816, by Dr. Troy, under the sanction of all the "Irish Roman Catholic prelates and chief clergy." "In this work," embracing these notes—(to what else could the remark refer, but the notes?)—"In this work can nothing be found, but what is agreeable to the doctrine and piety of the Catholic Church," said some of the Holy Fathers. Dr. Troy and others, when these notes were severely criticised, and their intolerant, wicked, blood-thirsty character exposed, and public odium was about to overwhelm them, *denied* that they wrote them, or knew anything about them. But Mr. Coyne, a Roman Catholic, who printed the Bible, declared that the notes were in the MS. when it came into his office ! One thing is certain, the notes were printed in the Bible, as published by Dr. Troy, and they *were not written by the printer*. And they embody the views, the faith, and the feelings of Roman Catholics. *

I give a few of them. On Hebrews v. 7, we have

* Dr. Milner, in his boasted "End of Controversy," says : "There is not, nor can be in the Established Church, or other societies of Protestants, any apostolic succession of ministry ; and, of course, the whole work of the *intrusive Church, preaching, sacrament, &c.*, being performed by mere human hands, is *invalid, profane, a perpetual imposition*, and must be without hope of divine acceptance at the bar of mercy" !

this language: "The translators of the English Protestant Bible should be *abhorred to the depths of hell*." On Matt. 3: "The good must tolerate the evil, when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger or disturbance of the whole Church; otherwise, where evil men, be they *heretics* or *other malefactors*, (?) may be punished and suppressed, without hazard of the good, they may, and ought, by public authority, either *spiritual* or temporal, be *chastised* or EXECUTED." On John x. 1: "*All Protestant clergy are thieves, murderers, and ministers of the devil*; leaders of rebellion against the lawful authority of the Catholic priests: they are engaged in a damnable revolt against the priests of God's Church, which is the bane of our days and country." On Mark iii. 12: "As the devil, acknowledging the Son of God, was bid to hold his peace; therefore heretics' sermons must not be heard—no, though they preach the truth. Their prayers and service, though ever so good in themselves, are, out of their mouths, no better than the howling of wolves." On Rev. xi. 6, 20: "Christian people, bishops especially, should have great zeal against heretics, *and HATE THEM, AS GOD HATES THEM*."* Luke ix. 55: "As the fact of Elias was not reprehended," for killing false prophets, "neither is the Church nor Christian princes *blamed by God for putting heretics to death*." On Hebrews xiii. 17: "When Rome puts heretics to death, and allows their punishment in other countries, their blood is not

* "Thou shalt not hate thy brother."—Ex. xix. 17. Every man is thy brother—"He that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth."—1 John ii. 11. "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death."—iii. 14. Who is right—John, the God who inspired him, or Rome?

that of saints, nor is it to be any more accounted of than that of *thieves, man-killers, or other malefactors,*" And on Acts xix. 19: "A Christian" (a Roman Catholic) "should deface and burn all heretical books."

The Bible published by Protestants, or circulated by them, papists being judges, is a "*heretical book.*" Hence, they "*deface and burn*" it. They have burned it in this "land of the free;" and when they could not do this, they have excluded it from some of the common schools, that the minds of the young, reared up without light, and a knowledge of the plan of salvation, might readily and surely receive the impress of Romanism from the lips of priests. This is sapping the very foundations of our Republic; for the Bible is the *substratum* of our Constitution, and of our liberties—the palladium of our hopes, temporal and eternal. Exclude, deface, burn *that*, and freedom of thought and action will have perished with it. 'Tis true, Roman Catholics publish the Douay translation of the Bible—only in Protestant countries, however,—and have expunged or left out these "wicked notes." But this became a necessity, per force of public sentiment and feeling, through Protestant teaching and influence. Before the Reformation, for centuries, that Church published no Bible in the vernacular tongue of any people. And even now there is no Bible published, of which I have any knowledge, except by Protestants, in Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, or any other living language of any nation or race, wholly under Roman Catholic influence. And the Douay translation can only be circulated and read under the license of a priest!

An extract from the life of Dr. Franklin, written by himself, will illustrate the doctrine and feelings of Rome in reference to this subject:

“Our humble family had early embraced the reformation. They remained faithfully attached during the reign of Queen Mary, when they were in danger of being molested on account of their zeal against Popery. They had an English Bible, and to conceal it the more securely, they conceived the project of fastening it, open, with pack-threads, across the leaves, on the inside of the lid of a close-stool. When my greatgrand father wished to read to his family, he reversed the lid of the close-stool upon his knees, and passed the leaves from one side to the other, which were held down on each by the pack-thread. One of the children was stationed at the door to give notice if he saw the *proctor*, an officer of the spiritual court, make his appearance: in that case, the lid was restored to its place, with the Bible concealed under it as before.”

“Rome never Changes.”

And further, in support of this view, and the proposition under consideration, I will give “the bull of Pius the VII., against Bible Societies, issued June 29, 1816, to the Archbishop of Gnesen, primate of Poland.”* This bull was translated and published in England, and then in this country, in the “National Intelligencer,” (May 26, 1817,) the “Baltimore American,” (June 6,) the “National Register,” (June 21,) and other papers. About its authenticity there can be no doubt. I have now before me a copy published by a Roman Catholic, accompanied with carefully-prepared reasons in vindication of its appearance, and arguments in defence of its positions and dogmatism. Here it is, *verbatim et literatim*:†

* Prussian Poland.

† The italicising is mostly my own.

"VENERABLE BROTHER: Health and apostolic benediction! In our last letter to you we promised, very soon, to return an answer to yours, in which you have appealed to this holy See, in the name of the other bishops of Poland, respecting what are called *Bible Societies*, and have earnestly inquired of us what you ought to do in this affair. We long since, indeed, wished to comply with your request; but an incredible variety of weighty concerns have so pressed upon us on every side, that till this day we could not yield to your solicitations.

"We have been truly shocked at this *most crafty device*, by which the *very foundations of Religion are undermined*; and having, because of the great importance of the subject, conferred in council with our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, we have, with the utmost care and attention, deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to *remedy and abolish this pestilence* as far as possible. In the meantime, we heartily congratulate you, venerable brother, and we commend you again and again in the Lord, as it is fit we should, upon the singular zeal you have displayed under circumstances *so dangerous to Christianity*, in having denounced to the Apostolic See *this defilement of the faith so eminently dangerous to souls*. And although we perceive that it is not at all necessary to excite him to activity who is making haste, since of your own accord you have already shown an *ardent-desire* to detect and overthrow the *impious machinations* of these innovators; yet, in conformity with our office, we again and again exhort you, that whatever you can *achieve by power*,* provide for by council, or effect by authority, you will daily execute with the utmost earnestness, placing yourself as a wall for the house of Israel.

"With this view we issue the present brief, viz.: that we may convey to you a signal testimony of our approbation of your excellent conduct, and may also endeavor therein still more and more to excite your pastoral solicitude and diligence. For the general good imperiously requires you to *combine all your means and energies* to frustrate the plans which are prepared by its enemies for the destruction of our most holy religion, whence it becomes an episco-

* That's the motto of Rome, "*achieve by POWER.*"

pal duty that you first of all expose the *wickedness of this nefarious scheme*, as you have already done so admirably, to the view of the faithful, and openly publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all the erudition and wisdom which you possess, namely : *“ that the Bible printed by heretics is to be numbered among other prohibited books, conformably to rules of the Index (Nos. 2 and 3), for it is most palpably evident from experience, that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit.”*(?) (Rule IV.) And this is more to be dreaded in times so depraved, when *our*” [*popery is in danger from pure Bible truth*] “ holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great *cunning and effect*,” [giving the Bible to the people.] “ and the *most grievous wounds are inflicted*” [by the Bible] “ on the Church. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the *salutary decree* of the Congregation of the Index, (June 13, '53,) *that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted, except such as are approved by the apostolic See, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of the holy fathers of the Church.*

“ We confidently hope that, in these turbulent circumstances, the Poles will give the clearest proofs of their attachment to the religion of their ancestors ; and by our care, as well as that of the other prelates of this kingdom, whom, on account of the faith, we congratulate abundantly, justify the opinion we have entertained of them.

“ It is moreover necessary that you should transmit to us as soon as possible the Bible which Jacob Whick published in the Polish language, with a commentary, as well as a copy of the edition of it lately put forth, without those annotations taken from the writings of the holy fathers of our Church, or other learned Catholics, with your opinion upon it ; that thus, from the collating them together, it may be ascertained, after mature investigation, that *certain errors are insidiously concealed therein*, and that we may pronounce our judgment on this affair for the *preservation of the true faith*.

“ Continue, therefore, venerable brother, to pursue this *truly vicious* course upon which you have entered, viz., diligently to fight the battles of the Lord for the sound doctrine, and warn the people intrusted to your care, that they fall not into the *snares* which are

prepared for their everlasting ruin. The Church demands this from you as well as from other bishops, whom our rescript equally concerns, and we most anxiously expect it, that the *deep sorrow we feel* on account of this *new species of tares* which an adversary has so abundantly sown, may by this cheering hope be somewhat alleviated; and we always very heartily invoke the choicest blessings upon yourself and your fellow-bishops for the good of the Lord's flock, which we impart to you and them by our apostolic benediction.

"Given at Rome, at St. Mary the Greater, June the 29th, 1816, the 17th year of our pontificate. "PIUS P. P. VII."

Among other reasons in vindication of this singular document, the writer referred to, gives the following:

"It exercises but a right always acknowledged by the Catholics in their pastors, to control and regulate the business of translating, adding notes, printing and circulating the Divine Book, as committed to their special care, with a view of preserving at all times the integrity of the text and fidelity of versions, and also the proper intelligence of the inspired sense which they consider as one and unchangeable."

Yes, they would "control and regulate the business of translating, adding notes, printing and circulating the Divine Book." They do control it in all countries where Rome holds undisputed sway, and never "translate," "print," or "circulate" it among the people; "for it is most palpably evident," says the infallible head, "from experience" (Rome's, not that of the souls of men), "that the Holy Scriptures, when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, *produced more harm than good*"—to Rome. Is Roman Catholicism, then, the religion of the Bible?

"Doing this," the writer continues, "the Catholic clergy may be considered, by liberal minds, (!) as showing in their own way their best respect and zeal for the Scriptures, the existence and right

interpretation and true sense of which do not seem to them likely to subsist in the long course of time, if entirely left to the care of unauthorized editors"!

But the particular version, the circulation of which called forth this bull, was translated and printed, as I have shown, by a priest, a Jesuit. He was not allowed to circulate it—to "*sow this new species of tares.*" Both the priest and the Bible were put down. Besides, the Bible Society is anxious, and will most gladly circulate in Roman Catholic countries, the Douay Bible, or any of their own translations, if they would make them in the vulgar tongue of any people. We are not afraid of the "Divine Book." Give us even Roman Catholic translations, and throw open the doors in Spain, Italy, Austria, etc., and we will most gladly enter and "*sow*" broad-cast, not *tares*, but *wheat*.

"*Care of unauthorized editors*"! If by this is meant that the "editors" and committees on revisions of the Bible Societies are illiterate and incompetent, or that they have no right, no inherent or conventional and divinely-vouchsafed right, to handle, keep, translate, print, and circulate the "*lively oracles*," given to *every man* "*as a lamp to his feet and a light to his pathway*"—*it is most false*. If the writer meant that they are "unauthorized" by the Pope, or priests, it is true; and the anathemas the latter hurl at all engaged in this business, prove the intolerance and tyranny of Rome. Nothing must exist, nothing be done, without her sanction.

But, do "authorized editors," the infallible Pope himself, and priests, correctly translate, and publish without error, the Holy Scriptures, so that the "*true*

sense subsists in the long course of time"? Translate and publish in the vulgar tongue, with one or two exceptions, they do not. But the Vulgate, the Latin version, what of the "true sense" or errors of that?

The Council of Trent decreed that the Holy Scriptures in the Vulgate version, were the inspired, infallible will of God. That had already undergone one or two changes since the days of Jerome, who had translated it from Hebrew and Greek into Latin, then the language of the common people. After the decree had passed, a very serious difficulty arose: the Vulgate was known to be erroneous in some things. This was admitted. Some of the prelates and divines desired, urged, that errors and all be considered as embraced in the decree. One of them thus spoke out: "Either God has failed in his promise of keeping his Church from error, or it is impossible that he can have left her to make use of an erroneous translation."* No, no, the eternal dogma *must* be maintained, "*the Church cannot err,*" and therefore the errors in the Vulgate, right before their eyes, which she had used, were no errors! Others maintained that a new, *faultless* version was needed. This opinion prevailed. A decree passed that a new one should be made. "There was much wisdom in this," says Bungener; "but it made the preceding decree only all the more strange."

"In consequence of this last decision, one naturally desires to know through what process it passed.

"A commission had been named, which did nothing. Toward the close of the Council, Pius IV. appointed another, but at Rome. Pius V. renewed it, and accelerated its labors. Twelve years

* As a rule of faith, tradition they decreed to be of equal force.

afterward, at the accession of Sixtus-Quintus, the work had hardly commenced, and that impetuous pontiff began to lose patience. He made it his own affair, and, at the commencement of 1589, announced by a bull, that the work was drawing to a close. The new Vulgate was printed under his own eyes at the Vatican, and *he himself revised the proofs.* ‘*We have corrected them with our own hand,*’ he says in the preface. ‘The work appeared, and it was impossible,’ says Hug,* ‘that it should not have given occasion for *criticism* and *pleasantry*. Many passages were found, particularly in the Old Testament, covered with slips of paper, on which new corrections had been printed; others were scratched out, or merely corrected with a pen. * * * In fine, the copies issued were far from all presenting the same corrections”!

Was Sixtus-Quintus, the *infallible* Roman pontiff, an *authorized editor*? Did the “*true sense*” of the “Divine Book” “*subsist*” in any of the copies of the edition, the proofs of which he “corrected with his own hand”? and did it “subsist” in *each* of the *dissimilar* copies that went out with different pen and type corrections? “Unauthorized editors,” indeed—that the reason why the holy indignation of Pius VII. is hurled with terrible anathemas against the Bible and Bible Societies! No, no! The truth is, this is a flimsy excuse to cover up Rome’s intolerance and real opposition to the Bible; a miserable fallacy, a store of which she constantly keeps on hand, or can manufacture at pleasure, which every one who is at all read in ecclesiastical history, and especially the history of the Bible, knows full well. Why, this is but one of *five bulls* which have been issued by *four* different Popes, against the Bible and Bible Societies, within the last fifty years.

* A Roman Catholic writer.

Now, let any patriot carefully read and weigh the language of this brief—this law of the Roman Catholic Church—its tone, its spirit, the object it designs to accomplish, and the calm, ingenious, fallacious vindication of its publication and doctrine by *an American citizen*, and tell me if she is not the bitter, uncompromising enemy of the Bible, and of civil and religious liberty, and if there is not danger from her growing numbers?

Finally, the chief dignitaries and writers in this Church, even in these United States, have distinctly admitted, nay, asserted, that she is intolerant, and that if she gains the ascendancy in this land, liberty of conscience—freedom of thought and action, are at an end.

Bishop Kenric says:

"Heresy and unbelief are *crimes*" [*i. e.*, Protestantism]. "And in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholic, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they will be" [are now] "punished as crimes."

The Bishop of St. Louis says:

"Protestantism of every kind Catholicity inserts in her catalogue of mortal sins; she *endures* it when and where she *must*; but she *hates* it, and *directs* all her *energies* to *effect its destruction*. IF THE CATHOLICS EVER GAIN, *which they surely will do*, AN IMMENSE NUMERICAL MAJORITY, RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THIS COUNTRY IS AT AN END."

The Bishop of Pittsburg, O'Connor, asserts that—

"*Religious liberty is merely endured* until the opposite can be carried into execution without peril to the Catholic world."

The Catholic Review responds:

"No rights for Protestants, or anybody else, except Catholics."

Brownson, in his Review, October, 1852, re-affirms the above, and thus teaches:

“The liberty of heresy” [Protestantism] “and unbelief is not a *natural right*. All the rights the sects have, or can have, are derived from the State, and rest on expediency. As they have in their character of sects, hostile to the true religion [Popery], no rights under the *law of Nature* or the *law of God*, they are neither *wronged nor deprived of liberty*, if the *State refuses to grant them any rights at all*”!

There is patriotism for you—there is Romanism! I have said, and I deliberately say it again—and I would throw into it all the emphasis of which I am capable—that ANY MAN, OR BODY OF MEN, IMBUED WITH THE SPIRIT OF POPERY, ARE INCAPABLE OF REPUBLICANISM.

The history of that Church for a thousand years, and *everything of her present*, demonstrate this beyond all doubt. That some Roman Catholics in *name*—and in *part*, in *practice*—just as some Mormons and Moham-medans, despite their systems, are patriots and true republicans, I believe and unhesitatingly admit. But they are few.

“The Shepherd of the Valley,” the organ of the Roman Catholics in the great valley of the Mississippi, thus gives us a glimpse at the heart of Rome, and would save me and the world the trouble of writing a single line to demonstrate that she is intolerant. Ponder and weigh well the following:

“Religious liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his own religion, is one of the most *wicked delusions* ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very name of liberty—except in the sense of a *permission* to do certain definite acts”—such as Rome commands—“*ought to be banished from*

*the very domain of religion. It is neither more nor less than a falsehood. No man has a right to choose his religion. None but an atheist can uphold the principles of religious liberty. Shall I, therefore, fall in with this abominable delusion? Shall I foster that damnable doctrine, that Socinianism, and Calvinism, and Anglicanism, and Judaism—are not every one of them mortal sins like murder and adultery? Shall I hold out hopes to my erring Protestant brother, that I will not meddle with his creed if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I, tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-blood. No. CATHOLICISM IS THE MOST INTOLERANT OF CREEDS. IT IS INTOLERANCE ITSELF; for it is the truth itself. (!) We might as rationally maintain, that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equalled by its absurdity"! **

The evidence, then, is overwhelming, that the Church of Rome is intolerant. She has, therefore, "fallen away" from the gentle teaching, heavenly spirit, and holy practice of the Gospel.

"Master," said the disciples, "we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us, and we forbade him, *because he followeth not us.*" "FORBID HIM NOT," was the emphatic reply of the loving, gentle Jesus.

The Church of Rome is persecuting and blood-thirsty.

This is another very grave charge, and should not be entertained, for a single moment, without the most clear and irrefragable proof. Such proof is now before me, and I submit it to the consideration of the candid reader, without the least doubt as to his decision.

* This originally appeared in "The Rambler," in England.

In the oath that every bishop takes, already given, we have this language:

“Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, the Pope, and his successors, I will to the utmost of my power persecute and destroy.”

By a decree of the Council of Constance, the bishop is *compelled* to do this, or forfeit his dignity, and perhaps his life. The fourth Council of Lateran passed a similar decree: “If any bishop be negligent in purging his diocese of heresy, he shall be deprived of his episcopal dignity.” The decretals of the Popes command the same, with a similar sanction. The Council of Trent says, “*when it can be done with safety*”!

The priest’s oath is to the same effect; for he swears to obey the canon law.

The oath of the Jesuit, as we have seen, “breathes out threatening and slaughter” to all “of the name Protestant.” “I do furthermore declare, that I will help, and do my utmost, to extirpate the heretical Protestant doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers.”

The Pope takes a solemn oath “to uphold,” or “defend the supremacy, power, and dignity of the holy apostolic See;” to “enforce the faith maintained in general Councils,” and “depose and deprive sovereign princes of their dignity and honors,” if they do not carry out the persecuting edicts—obey and execute the mandates of Rome.* Furthermore, Urban II., Alexander VI., Lucius III., Innocents III. and IV., Clement VII., Honorius III., Martin V., Paul IV., and scores of others, infallible though they were, have sent out

* The Councils of Constance, Pisa, Basil, Lateran, &c., passed such decrees.

bulls the most relentless persecuting, and cruel, against the Albigenses, Waldenses, Huguenots; in a word, against all who have had consciences not utterly seared, and minds and independence to think. Urban decided, that the person who, inflamed with zeal for Catholicism, "*should slay any of the excommunicated, was not guilty of murder.*" Lucius anathematized them and all their protectors, and unceremoniously consigned them to condign vengeance. Innocent sanctioned the sentence of Frederic, to burn them alive wherever found; which sentence emanated from the decrees of Councils, compelling kings and rulers to purge their dominions of all heresy. And Innocent, and others, granted a plenary indulgence—a full pardon and endless bliss, to the magistrates and warriors—the brutal tools and soldiers who went forth to butcher and burn.

But to refer to all the decrees of Popes, anathematizing Protestants and commanding them to be imprisoned and burned or buried alive; and their earnest words of approval of kings, dukes, generals, bishops and priests, for their zeal and success in putting to death, or killing by inches, with most cruel tortures, their subjects and fellow-beings for religion's sake, were to transcribe a tithe of the canon law of Rome.

In the Creed of Pius IV., to which every Roman Catholic is compelled to subscribe, without which, indeed, he could not be a Romanist, we have this language:

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic and apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

"I also profess, and undoubtedly receive, all other things, delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto; and all heresies whatsoever, condemned and anathematized by the Church. This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God's assistance, *to the end of my life.*"*

What, then, are the decrees of Councils, and the canon laws, in reference to persecution?—decrees and laws in existence and full force now."

"The Council of Oxford, in 1160," says Edgar, "condemned more than thirty of the Waldenses who had emigrated from Gascony to England, and consigned these unhappy sufferers to the secular arm. Henry the Second ordered them, men and women, to be publicly whipped, branded on the cheek with a red hot iron, and driven half naked out of the city; while all were forbid to grant these wretched people hospitality, or consolation. None, therefore, showed the condemned the least pity. The winter raged in all its severity, and the Waldenses in consequence perished of cold and hunger."

"The Councils of Tours, Lavour, Albi, Narbonne, Beziers, and Tolosa, issued various enactments of outlawry and extermination against the Albigenes and Waldenses. An inquisitorial deputation of the clergy and laity was commissioned for the detection of heresy and its partisans. The barons who through fear or favor should neglect the work of destruction, forfeited their estates, which were transferred to the active and ruthless agents of extirpation."

"The council of Tolosa, in 1229, waged war against the Bible, as well as against heresy. The sacred Synod strictly forbade the laity to possess the books of the Old and New Testament in the vernacular idiom."†

The third, the fourth, and the fifth General Councils

* This is given in the "Guide to Heaven" for Republicans.

† The "two witnesses" were murdered.

of Lateran passed decrees that "breathed out threatenings and slaughter" to all heretics, schismatics, and suspected persons. They were declared to be beyond the pale of Almighty goodness—without the covenanted mercies of God, and were consigned at once to the remorseless cruelties of the Inquisition.

The General Council of Constance, in 1418, with Martin V. at its head, (surely the decrees of that Council are infallible, and therefore eternally unchangeable) confirmed the persecuting decrees of the Lateran, and increased, if possible, their rigor, and turned them against the Wickliffites, Hussites, &c. These poor Christians were outlawed, imprisoned, burned, denied Christian burial, and their property confiscated.

Trent put its infallible seal of blood to all, but added, "where it can be done with safety"! The decrees of Popes breathe the same spirit, and teach and enforce the same thing.

The clergy, therefore, swearing on the holy evangelists, as they do, in the most solemn manner, "*to hold and teach all that the sacred canons and General Councils have delivered, defined and declared,*" what are we to think of them? What are they? We cannot escape the conclusion—there may be, are, doubtless, exceptions—that the priest to-day is just as the priest was under Innocent and others in the Waldensian butchery; under Gregory XIII.; in the slaughter of St. Bartholomew's, and in the bloody persecutions under "bloody Mary." And the laity who, in the Creed of Pius IV., now nearly three hundred years old, "*promise and swear true obedience to the bishop of Rome, and to receive all things delivered, defined and declared by the sacred*

canons and General Councils, and particularly the holy Council of Trent,"—what are they? God forbid! that I should reach a false conclusion in an issue so delicate, so deeply involving a large body of my fellow-beings; but as I look at these persecuting and blood-thirsty decrees of Councils, and of Popes—the canon laws of Rome—and have before my eyes, on the indelible pages of history, the massacres to which they have led, which, but for them, never would have disgraced humanity and the name of the pure religion of the inoffensive Jesus; and then at the solemn oath that priests and people take, to receive, believe in, hold and teach them; and then at the emphatic announcement of the infallible Pope, that the holy Roman Catholic Church cannot err, that she is unchangeable—*what am I to think?*

The conclusion, to my mind, is clear and irresistible, that the Church of Rome *to-day* is persecuting and blood-thirsty. She is not in this country, for she has not the power; it could not "be done safely."

The decrees of Councils and of Popes commanded kings and emperors to purge their dominions of heresy. A failure to do so, where Rome held undisputed sway, forfeited their crown and dominions. Hence edict after edict against the Waldenses, and all Protestants, have been sent forth by the kings of France, the emperors of Germany, the kings of England, of Spain, &c., for the destruction of thousands of their inoffensive subjects, whose only crime was, they loved their Bible, and would not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, and worship images and saints. Armies of the Church followed in hot haste to butcher and to burn.

Frederic, Emperor of Germany, in 1224, issued no less than four edicts against the Waldenses and Albigenses. He unceremoniously sentenced them alive to the flames and their property to confiscation. Princes, and governors, and magistrates were to execute the edicts in all their jurisdictions, or forfeit their honors and wealth to the champions of the Church. "This," says Du Pin, "was the first edict that made heretical opinions a capital offence." Oh! that it had been the last.

Louis XV. of France sent out, as late as 1724, in an imperial law, these commands and decrees:

"That the Catholic religion alone be professed in our kingdom, forbidding all our subjects, of what state, quality, or condition soever, to profess any other religion, or assemble for that purpose in any place, under any pretence whatever, on pain, if men, to be *condemned to the galleys forever*, and, if women, to be shorn and *shut up forever* in such places as our judges shall think proper, with *confiscation of goods*.

"We order that all such preachers as have convened assemblies not according to the said Catholic religion, or shall have preached, or discharged any other functions therein, *shall be punished with death*."

Similar laws are now in full force in Portugal, Spain, Austria, and Italy, and the dominions of the Pope, except Sardinia. The Church of Rome is their parent, godmother, nurse and life-blood. Break her power and free the millions that groan beneath her yoke, and such laws would not stand a single year.

The theologians of Rome have been imbued with the spirit of persecution, and have taught that heretics may be justly killed. Thomas Aquinas says: "Heretics may not only be excommunicated but justly killed.

Such the Church consigns to the secular arm, to be exterminated from the world by death." Vasques, Guido, Dominic, Bellarmine, Dens, and almost an innumerable company, teach this doctrine. Bellarmine and Dens are a little careful and prudent in reference to the circumstances and effects of putting to death. It must be effected with safety to Mother Church. The poor Huguenot and Protestant, in their estimation, deserve death and hell, but there is a *way* and a *time* to destroy them, which religion (Roman Catholic, of course) dictates must not be overlooked.

Now, the works of these theologians are the standard works of the Church; they are studied by the priest, and kept and read by the laity.

Let us examine, then, the practical workings of these decrees of Councils and of Popes, of Roman Catholic sovereigns and governors, and of the teachings of theologians:

"Shall we begin with the Waldenses? The history of this people lies before me. Cooped up in secluded valleys, at the foot of the Alps, they are supposed to be the descendants of Christians who sought refuge from the barbarian hordes that ravaged Italy during the decline of the Roman empire. They were a people simple, industrious, pious, scriptural in their faith and worship, and most unoffending in their conduct to all men. In two things they were as immovable as the Alps: they would not give up their Bibles, nor acknowledge the claims of the Pope. These were their only offences, and for these they were declared heretics, and the bloodhounds of Rome, the bishops and Inquisitors, were let loose on them. Two vagabond and brutal monks were sent from Rome to see that justice was meted out to the heretics. They deposed the kind bishops of the district for permitting the heresy, and substituted wolves in their place. Castelnau, a man of cruel heart, was sent as legate. Raymond of Toulouse was excommunicated because he re-

fused to join in the bloody crusade, but was made finally to consent by the cruel treatment of the Pope and Castelnau.* About three hundred thousand men were let loose upon this people, to punish them for the sin of worshipping God as did their fathers and the Apostles. The first outburst of their fury was on the town of Beziers, containing about sixty thousand persons. The legate gave up the people to slaughter and the town to pillage and flames.

"'But how,' said an officer, 'can we distinguish the Catholic from the heretic?' And what was the reply of the atrocious Legate Castelnau? It is known, to the confusion of Rome, in all the earth :—*'Kill all; the Lord will know his own!'* And every being was slain, and the town was consumed by fire!

"And this was only the beginning of sorrows. For nearly fifty years was the carnage continued. . Battle followed battle—city was burned after city—valley was entered after valley—until the rugged, yet fair heritage of this pious and simple people was converted into a howling wilderness—until a million of their number, under the sabre and tread of the minions of Popery, were made to bite the dust! After reciting a list of barbarities, Morland, the high-minded envoy of Cromwell to Turin, thus addressed the Duke of Savoy :—*'What need I mention more, though I could reckon up very many cruelties of the same kind, if I were not astonished at the very thought of them. If all the tyrants of all times and ages were alive again, they would be ashamed when they should find that they had contrived nothing, in comparison with these things, that might be reputed barbarous and inhuman. Heaven itself seems astonished with the crimes of dying men, and the very earth to blush, being discolored with the gore-blood of so many innocent persons.'* And all the guilt of this enormous barbarity lies on the soul of the Papal Church."*

"Lavour was taken by storm in 1211. Aimeric, the Governor, was hanged on a gibbet, and Girrarda his lady was thrown into a well, and overwhelmed with stones. All the citizens were mangled without discrimination, in promiscuous carnage. Four hundred were burned alive, to the extreme delight of the Crusaders." Even a Roman Catholic historian says he "shudders while he relates such horrors."

* Also by his sovereign, who had threatened to confiscate his estates.

† Rev. Dr. Murray's Letters to Chief Justice Taney.

“Languedoc, a country flourishing and cultivated, was wasted by these desolators. Its plains became a desert. A hundred thousand Albigenses, it is said, fell in one day ; and their bodies were heaped together and burned. Detachments of soldiers were dispatched in every direction to demolish houses, destroy vineyards, and ruin the hopes of the husbandman. The females were defiled. The march of the HOLY WARRIORS was marked by the flames of burning houses, the screams of violated women, and the groans of murdered men.”*

“All this barbarity was perpetrated in the name of religion.”* The Pope proclaimed the HOLY WAR, as it was called ; the clergy sung a hymn in praise to God for their victories ; and Mariana called the massacre “the visible judgment of heaven.” The Church triumphed.

From 1549 to 1562, at intervals, Henry of France persecuted and put to death, in the most cruel manner, the Waldenses—that people will surely have a bright martyr's crown—Lutherans, and Huguenots. Among the Waldenses, twenty-four towns were again destroyed. The citizens were butchered and burned.

“The massacre was so appalling,” says Edgar, “that it excited the horror even of Gonfridus, the Roman historian of these horrid transactions. The men, women and children, in general, at the approach of the hostile army, fled to the adjoining woods and mountains. * * * Many of the weeping mothers carried their infants in cradles on their arms ; while the woods and mountains re-echoed their groans and lamentations. These were pursued and immolated by the sword of Popish persecution, which never knew pity. * * * Five hundred women were thrown into a barn, which was then set on fire ; and when any leaped from the windows, they were received on the points of spears. The rest were consumed. * * * The women were subject to the most brutal insults. Girls were snatched from the arms of their mothers, violated, and afterwards treated with the

* Edgar's Variations.

most shocking inhumanity. The champions of the faith forced the dying women, whose offspring had been sacrificed in their presence." * * * "The Pope and his Court exalted" at this success. "The satisfaction which was felt at the extirpation of Waldensianism was," says Gonfridus, "in proportion to the scandal caused by that heresy in the Church." The friends of the Papacy, therefore, according to the same author, "reckoned the fire and sword well employed. Paul IV. made the President, Oppeda, the leader of the persecution, Count Palatine and Knight of St. John; and he was styled the defender of the faith, the protector of the faithful, and the hero of Christianity."

"The massacre of Orange, in 1562, was attended with the same horrors. The Italian army sent by Pope Pius IV., was commanded by Serbillon, and slew man, woman and child in indiscriminate slaughter." Some were killed with the sword, some thrown from racks, some roasted over a slow fire. Men and women were mutilated in so horrible a manner that modesty forbids to mention !*

The massacre of the Huguenots on the 24th of August, 1572, known as the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, excels everything, perhaps, in the annals of history for cold-blooded atrocity. It was planned and executed in the name of religion. It was instigated and consummated by the Church of Rome, whose joy was excessive when the inhuman work was done.

The Huguenots, or Protestants of France, had become numerous, and, as the advocates of religious liberty, of the circulation of the Scriptures and the freedom of conscience, had become formidable to Rome, she determined to put them down. The night of the 24th of August was selected for the wholesale

* So says a French historian, Varillas.

butchery. The history, "the facts," says Edgar, "have been detailed with great impartiality by Bossuet, Daniel, Davila, Thuanus and Mezeray." The queen laid this plan, which had been two years preconcerted, for the extinction of heresy. The execution was intrusted to the Duke of Guise, who was distinguished by his inhumanity and hatred of the Reformation. The Duke, on the occasion, was aided by the soldiery, the populace, and the king. The military and the people attached to Romanism thirsted for the blood of the Huguenots. His most Christian majesty, Charles IX., attacked in person his unresisting subjects with a gun, and shouted with all his might, kill! kill! One man—if he deserve the name—boasted of having, in one night, killed a hundred and fifty, and another of having slain four hundred. -

"The tocsin, at midnight, tolled the signal of destruction. The assailants spared neither old nor young, man nor woman. The carnage lasted seven days. Mezeray reckons the killed in Paris, during this time, at 5,000, Bossuet at more than 6,000, and Davila at 10,000. The Seine was covered with the dead that floated on its surface, and the city was one great butchery, and flowed with human blood. The court was heaped with the slain, on which the king and queen gazed, not with horror, but with delight. The king went to see the body of Admiral Coligny, which was dragged by the populace through the streets; and remarked in unfeeling witticism, that 'the smell of a dead enemy was agreeable.'

"The tragedy was not confined to Paris, but extended, in general, through the French nation. Special messengers were, on the preceding day, dispatched in all directions, ordering a general massacre of the Huguenots. The carnage, in consequence, was made through nearly all the provinces, and especially in Meaux, Troyes, Orleans, Nevers, Lyons, Toulouse, Bordeaux and Rouen. Davila estimates the slain at 40,000, and Sully at 70,000.

"The reason of this waste of life was enmity to heresy or Protestantism. A few, indeed, suggested the pretence of conspiracy. But this, even Bossuet grants, every person knew to be a mere pretence. The populace, tutored by the priesthood, accounted themselves, in shedding heretical blood, 'the agents of divine justice,' and engaged 'in doing God service.' * * * The king, accompanied with the queen and his court, went to mass, and returned solemn thanks for the glorious victory obtained over heresy. He ordered medals to be coined to perpetuate its memory. A medal accordingly was struck for the purpose with this inscription, 'PIETY EXCITED JUSTICE.'"

"The carnage was approved by the Pope and the Roman court. The Pope went in procession to the Church of St. Louis, to render thanks to God for the happy victory." He had a medal struck to commemorate the, to him, glorious event. On one side of the medal was the image of the Pope; on the other "*Hugnatorum strages, 1572.*" "*The slaughter of the Huguenots.*" "A picture of the massacre was added to the embellishments of the Vatican," says Rev. Dr. Murray, "to commemorate to all ages the triumph of the Church over her enemies. Upon that picture I have gazed with mine own eyes in the ante-room of the Sistine; and if Rome has changed her principles on persecution, why permit that picture to perpetuate her shame?"

"Shall we next consider the Irish St. Bartholomew of 1641? The chapter is a bloody one. Fired by their priests and by the popish gentry whose property had been confiscated during preceding disturbances, a plan was concerted, to which the perfidious Charles was no stranger, to cut off the Protestants of the island. A chief actor in the bloody tragedy was Ever McMahon, Romish bishop of Down, who was true to his oath, 'to persecute and fight against heretics to the utmost in his power.' Bad as was that of France,

the Irish Bartholomew was worse. I shudder while I quote from histories before me some of the narratives connected with this tragedy. On the Sabbath before the commencement of the massacre, the priests gave the wafer to the people, and sent them out with an exhortation to kill the Protestants and seize their property, as a certain preservative against the pains of purgatory! A company of nearly one hundred, men, women and children, were driven upon the ice on Lough Erne; having pushed them as far as they could go in safety, they flung the infants, torn from their mothers' arms, toward the point where the ice was weakest, and in seeking to rescue them all perished save two. Women were stripped naked and sent into the woods—to perish. Many were sportfully drowned; many hung; many stabbed to death; many boiled and roasted; many were hewn to pieces; many had their bellies ripped up and their bowels torn out; many were driven into houses and were burned in them; many were torn to pieces with dogs; and, in some cases, one end of the intestines was tied to a tree, and the person was driven round the tree until his bowels were all torn out! The account of the numbers who thus cruelly perished varies; but some judicious historians say that it could not be less than 200,000. Of this awful massacre Sir William Jones says: 'If we look into the sufferings of the first Christians under the cruel tyranny of the heathen emperors, we shall not find any one kingdom, though of a far larger extent than Ireland, where more Christians suffered, or more unparalleled cruelties were acted within the space of the first two months after the breaking out of this rebellion. Eastern barbarians never inflicted upon the most base wretches such execrable cruelty.' And all the blood there shed lies upon the soul—if soul it has—of the Papal Church.”*

But time would fail me to speak of the persecutions under “bloody Mary,” of the thousands that were incarcerated in the Tower and in dungeons, and who perished in the flames of Smithfield, of Oxford, and a hundred other places. Of the *“Invincible Armada,”*

* Letters to Taney.

the *one hundred and thirty ships*, bearing the fearful thunder of Spain and of Rome, sent forth by Philip II. and the Pope to destroy Protestant England. Of the Papal bulls, and instruments of torture, and priests and monks on board, commissioned and sent by the Church that cannot err, and that never changes, to subdue heretics to the *true faith*, or utterly exterminate them. Of the diabolical "*Gunpowder Plot*:" a plot to blow up the Parliament house, with the King and royal family, the nobility and assembled wisdom of England, and then, in the midst of the consternation and loss by the fearful tragedy, to seize upon the throne and bring the nation back to the dominion of Popery! Of the scores of thousands who have been imprisoned and butchered or burned alive in Spain, under the most cruel Philip, whom the Pope delighted to call "his most Catholic Majesty." Of the dying groans of the untold numbers that have rent the air and wailed up the valleys, and echoed amid the hills in Piedmont, and Hungary, and Switzerland, and Scotland. Of the hundreds of thousands who have died in dungeons, or perished on the rack, or amid the flames, under the tender mercies of "Mother Church," in Italy. Time would fail me; and the heart sickens, the head grows dizzy, and the eye swims, at the thought of such bloody persecutions; bloody persecution in the name of the benign religion of Him who, when he was reviled, reviled not, and who taught to "do unto all men as we would they should do unto us;" bloody persecution, to advance His religion! How true the description of the prophet: "She was drunken with the blood of the saints"!

Nor has the Church of Rome, even in this enlightened age and day, changed her principles or her practice. She is shorn of much of her power, but in heart and in act, where she can, she is the same. She has never voluntarily relinquished any ground, or changed or abrogated any principle. Her canon laws are now the same, and in full force. Pius IX. but a little over two years ago called "*liberty of conscience a most pestilential error*;" and issued a bull declaring the law of Sardinia "null and void." The noble Madai family, for reading the Bible, only half a dozen years since, were thrown into a prison in Tuscany, and their goods confiscated. There they would have lingered and perished but for the interference of Protestant England. And now there are lingering in the dungeons of the Inquisition in Italy, and the prisons of Austria, men and women for the crime of reading the Bible and of worshipping God according to the dictates of conscience, under the illumination of His Holy Spirit. And the laws of Portugal and Spain, Tuscany and Sicily, Naples and Austria, forbid the possession and reading of God's holy Word without the license of a priest, and the profession of any other religion than the Roman Catholic, and recognize them as crimes and misdemeanors, to be punished with imprisonment and loss of property and honor, and in some of them with death.

In the *Civiltà Cattolica*, a journal published at Rome, under the eye of Pius IX., and, indeed, his organ, if any one paper may be so considered, bearing date November, 1854, we have this doctrine emphatically set forth. The question discussed is:

"What are the limits of the power of coercion? There

are but two," the writer—perhaps the Pope—replies, "which, in fact, comprehend all others, *means and aim.*"

"The Church must inquire *how far her means extend, and what degree of severity her end requires?*

"What, then, are the limits of the Church's means? There are none *except the limits of human power and of the divine assistance by which the Church is comforted. As the Church commands the spiritual part of man directly, she therefore commands the whole man, and all that depends on man.**

"So far, then, as the *means* are concerned, the Church finds *no limit to her use of penal justice.*

"To what extent *may the Church make use of severity?* Here also we answer, *that the aim of itself does not impose any limits . . . There are no limits to the exercise of the COERCIVE power of the Church.*

"We leave it, then, to the Church to determine to what extent she can or must be severe. . . . It belongs to the Church to declare to what extent Catholicism has been offended, of which she alone can be a competent judge; but she will leave it to the lay judge to determine the punishment in the civil order." How condescending.

"This, however—may the enemies of the Church remember it—this is *voluntary moderation on the part of the Church, NOT A RIGHT CONCEDED TO ANY BODY to check her.* The Church is meek, because this is her spirit,(!) not as if she being a spiritual society, has no right to punish, EVEN WITH BLOOD OR WITH DEATH. . . . We shall have to allow the Church to use those means, without which she cannot subsist, and to MAKE EACH ONE who does not listen to authority and reason, LISTEN TO THE IMPRESSION OF A SENSIBLE PUNISHMENT" †

Verily, Rome "*never changes.*" In the Waldensian

* This makes out her claim to temporal power, and to do as she pleases with man.

† Translation by Dr. McClintock. The Italian and translation are both before me, in "The Temporal Power of the Pope," in separate columns.

murders, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in the Irish butchery, in the bloody persecutions of the bloody Mary, in the Invincible Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the incarceration of the Madai in the dungeons of Tuscany, and the solemnly-emphatic declaration of the mouth-piece of Pius IX. in the middle of the nineteenth century, that "*The Church has a right to punish, even with blood or with death;*" to make men who would be free and serve God in spirit and in truth, "*listen to the impression of a sensible punishment;*" she is ever the same. She "cannot err," her infallible head affirmed in 1832; and therefore cannot change. To admit that she has erred in all her butcheries is to deny her infallibility. No, no; she was *right* in the work of blood and death on St. Bartholomew's Day; and what was *right then, must be right now*. Give her the power, therefore, let her gain the ascendancy in these United States, and she will, must, persecute and kill as in Europe, and as in other days. The Protestants of this Republic, *then fallen*, would have undeniable, fearful demonstration of it, as they would be compelled to "*listen to the impression of a sensible punishment.*"

Finally, we have the crowning proof, that the Church of Rome is persecuting and blood-thirsty in the *Inquisition*, its *origin*, its *character*, its *bloody work*, and its *cherished perpetuation down to the present day*.

The Inquisition is a *spiritual court* which has power to *punish* for heresy, witchcraft, sorcery—in a word, for any religious opinions held contrary to the teaching of Rome—not only with excommunication, but with imprisonment for a term of years, or for life, to

send to the galleys as a slave, to banish from home and country, to strangle and to burn alive. Also to confiscate property, and to prohibit, upon pain of punishment and death, issues from the press, of any and all religious books published by Protestants, and the Bible. This court holds all its sessions in *secret*. Its work of torture, and condemnation, and imprisonment, and now of execution by strangling or by burning, is all done in *secret*. All who escape its grasp and fangs with their lives, by the clemency of the Inquisitors, are sworn never to divulge what they saw and suffered. Witnesses from any and every quarter, the most abandoned and the most designing, bitter enemies, are allowed to testify, not however, in the presence of the accused, who is not, and cannot be informed who has testified against him, and what, and why. He has no chance, therefore, to cross-examine, and refute, or rebut the testimony, and can have no advocate. Rumor is enough to lodge a complaint; and for the officials, or menials of the "Holy Office," as it has been most impiously called, to seize man or woman, high or low, and hurry them away at midnight, without a moment's warning or preparation; and then, if they will not voluntarily confess, though guiltless, they are put to the torture, till rending nerves, and dislocated, breaking bones, compel them to criminate themselves, with the vain hope, as they are falsely promised, of a speedy release; but alas! to undergo severer tortures and punishments for the crimes they have been made falsely to confess!

This court is, or was for a long time, in many countries, independent of the civil government. Its sad,

diabolical work of seizure at midnight, of even the best citizens, or fairest maidens, and their torture, or unholy abuse, and imprisonment and death, was carried on without the power of citizens, or magistrates, or governors, and sometimes even the king himself, to raise a voice or hand against it. The Inquisitors, always prelates, or priests, or monks, cut down with one hand friend or foe who stood in their way, and some whose only crime it was to be rich, and with the other appropriated his wealth to the "Holy Office," beggaring the heart-broken widow and orphaned children; and then, as if this were not enough, and to reach the climax of cruelty and corruption, would take the orphaned, friendless, fair young maidens, to their lustful bosoms!

Nothing so utterly at variance with the laws of God and humanity, in Heathen, or Mohammedan, or Christian lands, ever existed in any age of the world, in all the bloody wars and persecutions of our fallen race. It is the acme in the refinements of cruelty; the culmination of demon-like persecution, and torture, and butchery, and wickedness.

It had its rise in the beginning of the thirteenth century, about the year 1212, in the persecutions of the Waldenses. Dominic, now a Saint in the calendar of Rome, and to whom prayers are offered up! was its founder, and first general, or head. Innocent III., Honorius III., and Gregory IX., gave to Dominic letters-patent, or full power to imprison and put to death, and with him, may be said to be, the fathers of the "Holy Office." Frederic II., Emperor of Germany, took the Inquisitors, in 1224, under his protection, and gave

them full power "to punish obstinate heretics with death by burning, and *penitents* with perpetual imprisonment."

It soon extended over nearly all Europe. Innocent IV., in 1229, established it throughout Italy, except Naples, which then resisted its introduction. It was carried into Spain in 1233. Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, Portugal, &c., were compelled to receive this bloody court.

The following extract from a brief of Gregory IX., to the Inquisitors, will give some idea of the heartless cruelty of the Papacy, and the bloody work of the Inquisition, in its very infancy:

"Since, therefore, according to the office enjoined on us, we are bound to root out all offences from the Kingdom of God, and, as much as in us lies, to oppose such beasts (heretics), we deliver into your hands the sword of the word of God, which, according to the words of the prophet, Jer. xlviii. 10, 'Ye ought not to keep back from blood,' but inspired with zeal for the Catholic faith, like Phineas, make diligent *inquisition* concerning these *pestilent wretches*, their believers, receivers, and abettors, and proceed against those who, by such inquisition, shall be found guilty, according to the canonical sanctions and our statutes, which we have lately published, to confound heretical pravity, calling in against them, if need be, the assistance of the secular arm."

I have now before me Articles for regulating the proceedings of the Inquisition, drawn up in 1484, by Torquemada, Inquisitor-General of Spain. I will give a part of them. The first article relates to the organization of the Inquisition:

"2. An edict shall be published, accompanied by censures against those who do not *accuse themselves voluntarily* during the time of grace.

"3. A delay of thirty days shall be appointed for heretics to declare themselves.

"4. All voluntary confessions shall be written in the presence of the Inquisitors and a clerk.

"6. A part of the penance on a reconciled heretic, shall consist in his being deprived of all honorable employments, and of the use of gold, silver, and silk.

"7. *Pecuniary* penalties to be imposed on all who make a *voluntary confession*.

"8. The person who accuses himself after the term of grace cannot be exempted from the punishment of *confiscation*.

"10. The Inquisitors shall declare in their act of reconciliation, the *exact time* when the offender fell into heresy, that the *portion of property* to be confiscated may be ascertained.

"11. If a heretic, while in prison, demands absolution, and appears to feel true repentance, it may be granted, imposing at the same time *perpetual imprisonment*.

"12. But if the Inquisitors are suspicious of a prisoner's repentance, they may refuse absolution, and declare him to be a false penitent, and *condemn him to be burned*.

"14. If the accused persist in *denying* his crimes, even after the publication of his testimony, he is to be *condemned as impenitent*.

"15. If a *semi-proof* exists against a person who denies the charge brought against him, *he is to be put to the torture*; if he confesses during the torture, and afterwards confirms his confessions, *he is to be punished as convicted*; if he *retracts* he is TO BE TORTURED AGAIN, or *condemned to an extraordinary punishment*.*

"16. The entire deposition of the witnesses shall not be communicated to the accused.

"18. One or more Inquisitors shall be present when a prisoner is tortured, or appoint a commissioner in their place.

"19. *If the accused does not appear when summoned, he shall be condemned as a heretic*.

"20. When it is proved that a person by his *writings* or *conduct* dies a heretic, he shall be judged and condemned as such, *his body disinterred and burned, and his property confiscated*.

* Can the life of man be more completely in the hands, and at the disposition of his fellows

"22. In the event of a man burned for heresy leaving children under age, the Inquisitors shall grant them a *portion of their father's property under the title of ALMS*, and confide their education to proper persons."

"Three kinds of torture," says Puigblanch, "have been generally used by the Inquisition, viz., the *pulley*, the *rack*, and *fire*. The victim was conducted to a retired apartment, called the hall of torture, and usually situated under the ground, in order that his cries might not interrupt the silence which reigned throughout the other parts of the building. Here the court assembled, and the judges being seated, together with their secretary, again questioned the prisoner respecting his crime, which if he still persisted to deny, they proceeded to the execution of the sentence.

"The first torture was performed by fixing a pulley to the roof of the hall, with a strong hempen or grass rope passed through it. The executioners then seized the culprit, and leading him—naked to his drawers—put shackles on his feet, and suspended weights of one hundred pounds to his ankles. His hands were then bound behind his back, and the rope from the pulley strongly fastened to his wrists. In this situation he was raised about the height of a man from the ground, and in the meantime the judges coolly admonished him to reveal the truth. In this position, as far as twelve stripes were sometimes inflicted on him, according to the inferences and weight of the offence. He was then suffered to fall suddenly, but in such manner that neither his feet nor the weights reached the ground, in order to render the shock of his body greater.

"The torture of the rack, also called that of water and ropes, and the one most commonly used, was inflicted by stretching the victim, naked as before, on his back,* along a wooden horse or hollow bench, with sticks across like a ladder, and prepared for the purpose. To this his feet, hands, and head were strongly bound in such a manner as to leave him no room to move. In this attitude he experienced *eight* strong contortions in his limbs, viz. : two on the fleshy parts of his arms above the elbows, and two below, one on each thigh, and also on the legs. He was besides obliged to swallow

* Men and women were frequently stripped entirely naked and alike tortured.

seven pints of water, slowly dropped into his mouth on a piece of silk or ribbon, which by the pressure of the water, glided down his throat, so as to produce all the horrid sensations of a person who is, drowning. At other times his face was covered with a thin piece of linen, through which the water ran into his mouth and nostrils, and prevented him from breathing. Of such a form did the inquisition of Valladolid make use, in 1528, toward the licentiate Juan Salas, physician of that city.

“ For the torture by fire, the prisoner was placed with his legs naked in the stocks ; the soles of his feet were then well greased with lard, and a blazing chafing-dish applied to them, by the heat of which they became perfectly fried. When his complaints of the pain were loudest, a board was placed between his feet and the fire, and he was again commanded to confess, but this was taken away if he persisted in his obstinacy. This species of torture was deemed the most cruel of all ; but this, as well as the others, was indiscriminately applied to persons of both sexes, at the will of the judges, according to the circumstances of the crime, and the strength of the delinquents.

Other kinds of torture were used, especially in Italy. The *dice*, the *comes*, the *rods*, the *thumb-screw*, the *iron collar*, the *woolen glove*, and last, though not least—and how many more God only knows—the *pendulum*. In this last, the poor victim, who might have undergone other tortures, was placed upon his back, with his face beneath a long pendulum, with an oval, sharp knife in the end, which by pulleys is oscillated, and at each vibration it approaches nearer and nearer the face, till at length it touches and then cuts the skin, and down deeper, deeper, till the gashing, parting face lets the trembling spirit free. This was less cruel than many others, because more expeditious.

“ The duration of the torture,” says the same excellent writer, Puigblanch, “ by a bull of Paul III., could not exceed an hour ; and if in the Inquisition of Italy it was not usual for it to last so long,

in that of Spain, which has always boasted of surpassing all others in zeal for the faith, it was prolonged for an hour and a quarter. The sufferer through the intensity of pain, was sometimes left senseless, for which case a physician was always in attendance, to inform the court whether the paroxysm was real or feigned ; and according to his opinion, the torture was continued or suspended. When the victim remained firm in his denial, and overcame the pangs inflicted on him, or when, after confessing under them, he refused to ratify his confession within twenty-four hours afterwards—he has been forced to undergo as far as three tortures, with only one day's interval between each. Thus while his imagination was still filled with the dreadful idea of his past sufferings, which the '*Compilations of Instructions*' itself calls *agony*, his limbs stiff and sore, and his strength debilitated, he was called upon to give fresh proofs of his constancy, and again endure the horrid spectacle, as well as the repetition of excruciating pangs, tending to rend his whole frame to pieces.

Well might a Spanish writer exclaim :

“What blasphemy in this tribunal, ever to pretend to be actuated by a *divine impulse*, when every brick seems a conjuring spell, and every officer a tormenting fiend ! Why such scandalous methods, as a secret chamber, an unseen tribunal, invisible witnesses, a perfidious secretary, and merciless servants—confiscation of goods through fraud and guile, keepers as hard-hearted as the relentless walls, the fiscal mutes, the shameful *san-benitos*, unrighteous racks, a theatre filled with horror to astonish the prisoner, a hypocritical sentence, a disguised executioner, and a peremptory judge ? In all the times of Paganism, no such Roman tribunal was ever erected. In their amphitheatres, men had not quite put off humanity ; those condemned to die were exposed to wild beasts to be torn to pieces. they knew their executioner ; but here the condemned are tormented by disguised ones—men they should be by their shape, but devils by their fierceness and cruelty.”

And yet the Inquisition, it is proclaimed, is a *religious* tribunal, and we know that it is the cherished offspring and right-arm of the infallible Papacy !

I will give a few cases of torture, and suffering, and death, of the hundreds of thousands that fill and crowd the pages of the history of this bloody tribunal for six hundred years.

Arrests generally take place silently, in the dark, solemn hour of midnight. All are at rest; and visions of peace, and friends, and glory, or of approaching, threatening fiends, flit across the mind, or disturb the slumbering soul, when suddenly a small band of monsters approach the residence and demand entrance. "In whose name is this required?" it is tremblingly asked. "The Holy Office," is the stern, low response. "The thunderbolt, launched from the black and angry cloud," says Puigblanch, "strikes not with such alarm, as the sound of 'Deliver yourself up a prisoner to the Inquisition!' Astonished and trembling, the unwary citizen hears the dismal voice; a thousand different affections at once seize upon his panic-stricken frame—he remains perplexed and motionless. His life in danger, his deserted wife and orphan children, eternal infamy the only patrimony that now awaits his bereft family; are all which rush upon his mind: he is at once agitated by an agony of dilemma and despair. The burning tear scarcely glistens on his livid cheek, the accents of woe die on his lips, and amid the alarm and desolation of his family, he is borne away to dungeons, whose damp and bare walls can alone witness the anguish of his mind." What does he suffer there? And what is his end? In untold cases God only knows!

In 1560—I will not go back beyond the dawn of the glorious Reformation—a lady of some rank and influ-

ence at Seville, Spain, Juana de Xeres y Borhorques, was apprehended and thrown into prison, in consequence of some implications extorted from her sister Maria by the rack. "Being six months gone in pregnancy, Dona Juana was imprisoned in the public jail till her delivery. Eight days thereafter her child was taken from her, and she was placed in a cell in the Inquisition. A young woman was imprisoned beside her, who exerted herself to the utmost to promote the afflicted lady's recovery; but the attendant was soon subjected to the torture herself, and remitted to her cell mangled by the process. As soon as Dona Juana could rise from her bed of rushes, she was in her turn tortured by the Inquisitors. She would not confess. She was placed on one of their instruments of cruelty. The cords penetrated through the delicate flesh to the bone of her arms and legs. Some of the internal vessels burst. The blood flowed in streams from her mouth and nostrils. She was conveyed to her cell in a state of insensibility, and died in the course of a few days."

Eight females, however, at the same time survived the torture, and were led out and burned.

In the same year, at Muréia, thirty were burned. In the same place in 1562, twenty-three perished. In the next year seventeen, and the two following thirty-five. For a long period there was an "*Auto da fé*"* in every prominent city and province of Spain, annually. Hundreds of thousands perished, as many were imprisoned for life or banished, and as many left their

* "An act of faith." It ought to be styled: "Burning to death at the instigation of Satan."

native land seeking safety by flight. The Duke of Alva once boasted that thirty-six thousand had perished in his dominions.

The most fearfully imposing "*auto da fê*," which, perhaps, ever took place, occurred at Madrid in the presence of Charles II. and the royal family and nobility and an immense multitude, in 1680:

"On the day appointed," says Sime, in the "*History of the Inquisition*," "the procession began to move from the Inquisition, in the following order, at seven o'clock in the morning:

"The soldiers of the faith came first, and cleared the way; next followed the cross of the parish of St. Martin, covered with black, and accompanied with twelve priests clothed in surplices, and a clergyman with a pluvial cope; then came the prisoners to the amount of *one hundred and twenty—seventy-two of whom were women*, and forty-eight men; some came forth in effigy, and the remainder in person. First in the order of the procession were the effigies of those condemned persons who had died or made their escape, and amounting in all to thirty-four; their names were inscribed in large letters on the breast of their effigies; and those who had been condemned to be burned, besides the corozas or cap on their heads, had flames represented on their dresses, and some bore boxes in their hands, containing the bones of their corresponding originals. * * * Behind the effigy of each culprit were also conveyed boxes containing their books, when they had been seized with them, for the purpose also of being cast into the flames. The Courts of the Inquisition followed immediately after.

"Next, on horseback, paraded the sheriffs and other ministers of the city, together with the chief bailiffs of the Madrid Inquisition. Then the familiars, and then a great number of ecclesiastical ministers. Behind them the Corporation of Madrid, preceded by the Mayor. * * * Lastly, came the Inquisitor-General. He was accompanied by an escort of fifty halberdiers, dressed in satin. He was clothed in a suit of black silk, embroidered in silver, with diamond buttons, and attended by eighteen livery servants.

The prisoners personally condemned to death were nineteen; thir-

teen men and six women. * * * The burning place was sixty feet square, and, consequently, sufficiently capacious. * * * Some were previously strangled, and the others at once thrown into the fire."

The living with the dead bodies, and the bones and books, were all reduced to ashes, which was not till "nine next morning." All the others, by confessions and penitence, were reconciled and sent back to prison—some for life, and others were punished in various ways.

The Rev. Mr. Wilcox, of the Church of England, describes an "*auto da jé*" which he saw near Lisbon, in 1706. He says:

"Five condemned persons appeared, but only four were burned—Antonio Travanes being reprieved after the procession. Heztor Dias and Maria Pinteyra were burned alive, and the other two were strangled. The woman was alive in the flames for half an hour, and the man above an hour. The king and his brother were seated at a window, so near as to be addressed for a considerable time, in very moving terms, by the man, as he was burning; and, though he asked only a few faggots, he was not able to obtain them!"

On the accession of Philip V. to the throne of Spain, in 1700, as Archduke Charles of Austria claimed it, a civil war broke out. Philip employed some fourteen or fifteen thousand troops of the King of France. The French troops, under their intrepid leader, M. Legal, took Saragossa. He levied a contribution on the inhabitants and the *convents*. The Dominicans came to an open rupture with him; and, being familiars of the "Holy Office," and Inquisitors, tried first to raise a mob against him, and then excommunicated him for sacrilege. But they had not to do with unarmed citizens and defenceless females. The indignant French-

man ordered out four regiments of troops, and turned all the wicked fraternity out of the massive buildings of the lordly tribunal. "The doors of all the prisons were thrown open," says a historian, "and *four hundred prisoners set at liberty*. Among them were *sixty young women, who were found to be the private property of the three Inquisitors!* whom they had unjustly taken from their fathers' homes in the city and neighborhood."*

The Inquisitors complained to Philip, but as the troops were not his own, compulsory measures would drive them from his support. He, therefore, could do nothing.

"The Archbishop, however," says the historian, "*deeply concerned for the honor of the holy tribunal*, requested M. Legal to *send the women to his palace (!)*, promising that he would *take care of them (?)*, and threatening with excommunication all who should dare to defame the tribunal of the Inquisition!" But the French officers, he was informed, had taken possession of them.

Poor women! taken from happy homes, and shut up in worse than a living hell to gratify at will the *holy desires* of the *holy Inquisitors!* and then liberated to be dragged away amid scenes of pollution! But any place or condition was better than the prison of those corrupt tyrants and their lawless associations, in which, after a few weeks or months, having served an end, they might, at any moment, be broken on the wheel and consumed at the stake.

Napoleon, while in power in Spain, gave a powerful blow to the 'usurpations and tyranny of the Inquisition.

* Talk of Mormonism! it is Christianity compared to such.

In 1808 he suppressed the Holy Office at Chamistin, near Madrid. On the 22d of February, 1813, the Cortes, who assembled at Madrid, abolished the Inquisition throughout the kingdom. Whatever may have been the vast designs of Napoleon, if, in his far-reaching views and the mighty sweep of his plans and aims, he seemed to be a tyrant, he was the friend of the masses, and of down-trodden, bleeding humanity. As soon as Ferdinand VII. was securely seated upon the throne in 1814, he reestablished this foul blot on the name of Christ, and scourge of our race. Early in 1815, the 12th of February, the Holy Inquisitors issued their mandate to all confessors, and peremptorily required all Protestants, or suspected persons, "to accuse themselves before said confessors." And "on the 5th of April, Don Francisco Xavier de Mier y Campillo, Inquisitor-General, published an edict, offering a term of grace to those who had fallen into the crime of heresy!" "The Man of Sin," the "beast," stood forth again.

In 1817 Lieut.-Col. Don Juan Van Halen was imprisoned in the dungeons of this still bloody tribunal. He has given us a very graphic and faithful account of his imprisonment and sufferings. He was arrested at Murcia on the 21st of September, and lodged in the dungeons there; thence he was removed to Madrid. A brief extract will give the reader a glimpse of what he endured, and show that Rome in this enlightened age is the same persecuting, blood-thirsty tyrant that she was in the dark ages:

"About eight o'clock at night, on the 20th of November, Don Juanita (one of the Inquisitors) entered my dungeon with a lantern in his hand, followed by four other men, whose faces were concealed

by a piece of black cloth, shaped above the head like a cowl, and falling over the shoulders and chest, in the middle of which were two holes for the eyes. I was half asleep when the noise of the doors opening awoke me, and by the dim light of the lantern I perceived those frightful apparitions. Imagining I was laboring under the effects of a dream, I earnestly gazed awhile on the group, till one of them approached, and pulling me by the leather strap with which my arms were bound, gave me to understand by signs that I was to rise. Having obeyed his summons, my face was covered with a leather mask, and in this manner I was led out of the prison. After walking through various passages on a level with that of my dungeon, we entered a room, where I heard Zorilla (the other Inquisitor) order my attendants to untie the strap.

“ ‘Listen with great attention,’ he then exclaimed, addressing me : ‘since you have hitherto been deaf to the advice which this holy tribunal has repeatedly given you in their spirit of peace, humanity and religious charity. (!) Propagator of secret and impious societies, established by the heresies of their members to destroy our holy religion and the august throne of our Catholic sovereign, you have maintained, for the space of a year, an uninterrupted correspondence with more than two hundred sectarians. * * * This holy tribunal has at last recourse to rigor. It will *extort* from you the truths, which neither the duty of a religious oath, demanded without violence, nor the mild admonitions which have been so often resorted to, in order to induce you to make the desired declarations, have been able to obtain. This evident pertinacity obliges us to use a *salutary severity*. We judge the cause of our Divine Redeemer and of our Catholic King, and we shall know how to fulfil the high ministry with which the supreme spiritual and temporal authority has invested us. * * * The most *rigorous torments* will be employed to obtain from you these truths, or *you shall expire in the midst of them*. All the charges I have just mentioned in a summary manner must be amply explained—yes! amply explained! Justice, God, and the king require that it should be so. This holy tribunal will fulfil their duties—yes!’

“The agitation of the moment permitted me to utter only a few words, which, however, were not listened to, and I was hurried away to the further end of the room, the jailer and his assistants

exerting all their strength to secure me. Having succeeded in raising me from the ground, they placed under my arm-pits two high crutches, from which I remained suspended; after which, my right arm was tied to the corresponding crutch, whilst the left being kept in a horizontal position, they encased my hand open in a *wooden glove* extending to the wrist, which shut very tightly, and from which two large iron bars ran as far as the shoulder, keeping the whole in the same position in which it was placed. My waist and legs were similarly bound to the crutches by which I was supported; so that I shortly remained without any other action than that of breathing, though with difficulty.

“ Having remained a short time in this painful position, that unmerciful tribunal returned to their former charges. Zorilla, with a tremulous voice that seemed to evince his thirst for blood and vengeance, repeated the first of those he had just read, namely, whether I did not belong to a society whose object it was to overthrow our holy religion, and the august throne of our Catholic sovereign? I replied that it was impossible I should plead guilty to an accusation of that nature. ‘Without any subterfuge, say whether it is so,’ he added in an angry tone.

“ ‘It is not, sir,’ I replied. The glove which guided my arm, and which seemed to be resting on the edge of a wheel, began now to turn, and, with its movements, I felt by degrees an acute pain, especially from the elbow to the shoulder, a general convulsion throughout my frame, and a cold sweat overspreading my face. The interrogatory continued, but Zorilla’s questions of ‘Is it so? Is it so?’ were the only words that struck my ear amid the excruciating pain I endured, which became so intense that I fainted away, and heard no more the voices of those cannibals.

“ When I recovered my senses, I found myself stretched on the floor of my dungeon, my hands and feet secured with heavy fetters and manacles, fastened by a thick chain, the nails of which my tormentors were still riveting! Left by those wretches stretched in the same place, I could have wished that the doors, which closed after them, should never again open. Eternal sleep was all I desired, and all I asked of Heaven. It was after much difficulty that I dragged myself to my bed. It seemed to me that the noise of my chains would awaken the vigilance of my jailers, whose presence was

to me the most fatal of my torments. I spent the whole of the night struggling with the intense pains which were the effects of the torture, and with the workings of my excited mind, which offered but a horrible perspective to my complicated misfortunes. The state of mental agitation, and the burning fever which was every moment increasing, soon threw me into a delirium, during which I scarcely noticed the operation performed by my jailers, of opening the seams of my coat to examine the state of my arm."

After undergoing almost continued and indescribable cruelties—cruelties that none but blood-thirsty demons would inflict—under a gracious Providence, by almost a miracle, he escaped, in 1818. That saved him from a horrible death under Zorilla's fangs.

And this persecution, this satanic cruelty, was perpetrated in the latter part of the first quarter of this glorious nineteenth century! I may add, and I am glad to add, for the honor of human nature, that, a few years since, the Inquisition was again suppressed in Spain. Not, however, by "Mother Church;" oh, no; but without her consent and against her will. The light of this happy age, the effulgence of Protestantism, had at length dawned upon the moral gloom which shrouded the Spanish mind, and it was hailed as the epoch of a brighter day; and, despite the frown and thunder of Rome, that mind rose in its might and overturned this bloody tribunal which had for centuries poured out the best blood of that unhappy country, and which will forever remain as a foul blot upon her name. When the prisons were thrown open, haggard victims came forth, some of whom had grown gray in their lonely cells, and others were under the sentence of death.

In the Revolution in Rome, in 1848, the "Holy In-

quisition" was invaded, its dark dungeons thrown open, and the wretched inmates set free. Some of them knew not for what offence they had been incarcerated; some had been tortured and were to have suffered death. In one cold, damp cell, the bones of a female skeleton, and long locks of silken hair, were found.
 * * * * * When Pius IX. was again firmly seated upon the throne, and the people put at defiance by French and Austrian bayonets, he reëstablished the "Holy Office" with its prisons, and racks, and pulleys, and iron collars, and gloves, and water, and fire. And now, in the dark hour of midnight, its diabolical work of seizure, and imprisonment, and torture, and death, goes on, close to the splendid palace of him who, "clothed in purple and fine linen," sitteth in the temple of God and proclaims that he is the "Vicar of the Son of God"!

The graphic picture of the poet does not bring out the dark shades of this unholy tribunal in all their gloom and in all their horror. No! none can fully describe the Inquisition; no painter can transfer it to canvas:

"The Inquisition, model most complete,
Of perfect wickedness, where deeds were done—
 Deeds! let them never be named—and sat and planned
 Deliberately, and with most musing pains,
How to extremest thrill of agony
 The flesh, the blood, the souls of holy men,
 Her victims, might be wrought; and when she saw
 New tortures of her laboring fancy born,
 She leaped for joy, and made great haste to try
 Their force—*well pleased to hear a deeper groan!*
 The supplicating hand of innocence,

That made the tiger mild, and, in its wrath,
 The lion pause, the groans of suffering most
 Severe, were nought to her : *she laughed at groans ;*
No music pleased her more ; and no repast
So sweet to her, as blood of men redeemed
By blood of Christ. Ambition's self, though mad,
And nursed on human gore, with her compared,
Was merciful."

The evidence, then, is clear—no evidence indeed could be more so—that *the Church of Rome is persecuting and blood-thirsty*. She is the woman that John saw sitting on the scarlet-colored beast, who *was drunken with the blood of the saints*.*

Now, if the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, like the Councils of Basil, Constance, Lateran, and Trent, had passed persecuting laws ; if her senior bishops had decreed the utter ex-

* I had intended to speak of the Inquisition at Goa, in the East Indies—*missionary ground*—but my space will not permit. Thousands have been immured in dungeons there, and tortured and burned alive. M. Dellon, a French physician, who was imprisoned there for two years, his property confiscated, and who was sentenced to the galleys for five years, for no crime but speaking against the "Holy Office," gives a very graphic account of it. C. Buchanan, LL.D., who travelled in India in 1808, visited Goa, and confirms, in his *Christian Researches*, all that M. Dellon has said. Buchanan talked with the Inquisitors, and they admitted what M. Dellon had written, but said he mistook their *motives* ! and judged harshly of the holy Catholic Church ! I would refer the reader especially to Buchanan's work.

I had also intended to give the reader the oath of abjuration that the Inquisition imposed on Galileo, when, in the ignorance of its infallibility, it made him deny the truth of science. And also the persecution of Free Masons in Spain, and other countries, in the middle of the last century. And, finally, to give a brief list of some of the books, Locke's, Bacon's, Milton's, &c., &c., prohibited by this tribunal. But enough and more than enough.

termination of all who are not in heart and soul Methodists; if her laity, magistrates, governors, and all in authority, had been taught and commanded to kill and destroy all such, and confiscate their goods; if her theologians and writers, Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, Benson, Watson, Asbury, Emory, Bangs, &c., had taught the same demoniac doctrine; if all these decrees and teachings had never been repealed nor rejected; if a spiritual court, some terrible, mysterious Inquisition had existed for a hundred years and more, in her bosom and by her authority, whose dark dungeons had ever heard the sighs of incarcerated victims, whose multiplied instruments of torture had ever groaned with the rending muscles and breaking bones of tortured men and women, and whose fires had ever blazed with martyred innocents; if that Inquisition were in full blast now; and if her past history had been stained with the blood of a St. Bartholomew, of a Smithfield, of an Irish massacre, of a Gunpowder Plot, and of blood, *blood!* in ten thousand other places; and then, if she were gravely to teach that she cannot err, and never changes, what would be the judgment of every sane, candid mind? Oh! what would be the scathing, terrible, just denunciations of every patriot and friend of humanity in this mighty Republic, and, indeed, everywhere, where the liberty of speech is enjoyed, and men have souls in them. And yet we are told with affected feelings of surprise and indignation, by some presses and aspiring orators, that the Church of Rome is not a persecuting Church! and with the next breath, that if Protestants had the power they would persecute and destroy as Rome has done. Such

are ignorant, totally ignorant of the canon law and history of this corrupt woman, who is, as inspiration represents, "drunken with the blood of the saints;" or, they are wicked, truculent sycophants, who would sell their country to a tyrant for personal aggrandizement.

But it has been affirmed, some Protestants in *name* have averred, that Protestants have persecuted and wantonly put to death, as Roman Catholics have done. This deserves a passing, serious thought.

When the Reformation first dawned, men saw not as in the clear noon-day. The Bible, which had been impiously kept from the people, was but just beginning to circulate; the benign power of a *pure* Gospel, and the benevolent influence of a holy, free press, were not enjoyed and felt, as now. They had not made their impress upon the great masses struggling to be free. The mind was in a *transit* state. The excesses, the persecutions, the shedding of blood, therefore, was an evil stream that flowed out of a fountain not fully cleansed. Who, then, was most to blame? Rome, I unhesitatingly answer; Rome, who had kept the mind in darkness, aye, who had *taught* such lessons of cruelty, and had given constant, terrible proof, for ages, that *she thought it was right*. But now "it is high noon"—look abroad! . What persecuting canon lives in the creeds of Protestants? Where, in old England, in Scotland, in these United States, do prisons groan with incarcerated victims for religion's sake, and stakes flame with the consuming flesh of men and women?

To illustrate; and I would have the reader weigh well what I say :

If a revolution were to overturn the throne of Austria, and the people—made to be free—were trying to establish a republic, would there be no excesses, no shedding of royal and noble blood? The history of revolutions in Europe fearfully demonstrates that there would be. Would republicanism be entirely responsible for those excesses and that blood? Every statesman, and every well-read man, with an honest, patriot's heart in him, would indignantly respond, no! Go back two hundred and fifty or three hundred years, and stand by the side—aye, take the position and light and training in Rome's school—of a Protestant struggling for the true faith, and to throw off the worst tyranny that ever lorded it over and cursed poor fallen man, and tell me what you would do.

Furthermore, Protestants had just escaped the fires of persecution and the bloody grasp of Mother Church, who still shook her terrible thunders over their heads, and whenever and wherever she could—I appeal to history—waged cruel, exterminating wars against them. They retaliated. This principle in fallen human nature is very strong, and the last, perhaps, which is sanctified. In retaliating they erred, grievously erred; but is not this some palliation? Had Rome never persecuted, never tortured, and burned alive, but under such circumstances, some shades of light would now gild, with a mellow tint, the dark cloud that hangs upon her soul.

In Queen Elizabeth's reign, Roman Catholics were imprisoned for crimes and misdemeanors against the peace and dignity of the State, and were put to death for high treason. They sought in their zeal to over-

throw the Protestant throne, and to place a Roman Catholic prince at the head of the nation. They were punished, therefore, as rebels. It is not my province to inquire, were they such? But to call their imprisonment and execution a religious persecution is a misnomer.

Now, if the abolitionists at the North, members of churches and ministers, were guilty of overt acts of treason, and were imprisoned and put to death, who could cry out, religious persecution?

This was precisely the case in good Queen Bess' time. The government was threatened; and her vigilance and firmness saved the throne and civil and religious liberty. And the debt of gratitude we owe her memory none can fully estimate. The pure, bright, limpid stream of civil and religious liberty that rolls through, and waters and fertilizes our own, our native land, if it did not issue from beneath her throne, its channel was kept clear, and it was sent singing on its glad way to bless the world. May it roll on forever! Elizabeth saved Protestantism, and *we are free because we are Protestants.*

But the weak, inoffensive, good Waldenses were persecuted only for religion's sake. And the thousands butchered on St. Bartholomew's Day were acknowledged by the treacherous, inhuman Charles, to be among the most loyal and best citizens of France.

Protestants, then, never have persecuted, and imprisoned, and destroyed, as Roman Catholics have done. Their spirit, their principles, their religion, are as different from Roman Catholicism as day is from night.

But it is averred that Protestants, if they had the

power, would persecute, and imprison, and burn, as the Church of Rome has done. This is a foul libel on Protestantism and on our holy religion. Who rules England but Protestant Episcopalians? Who predominate and give tone to sentiment and action in Scotland, but Presbyterians? Who have established, and proclaimed to the world, and now defend, civil and religious liberty in this happy Union, but Protestants? Where is the Bible freely circulated, where does an untrammelled press throw off its light, where are the sacred rights of conscience fully protected, where the liberty of speech and free discussion guaranteed to all, and where does each and all worship God according to his own sense of duty, and under his own vine and fig-tree, in perfect security, but where Protestants reign and rule? No, no! Protestantism must "tread steps backwards," the source of her peace and enlarged views and pure principles, the love and favor of God, must be dried up, or turned away, and the light which shineth unto the perfect day, and the firm foundation of her liberties, the blessed Bible, must be taken from her, and her great heart must be made bitter as the waters of Meribah, ere she can persecute unto death. *Then* she will have "fallen away," and be as Popery. *Then* she will no longer be the Church of God, nor preach the pure religion of Him who is love. *Then* Roman Catholicism, the great apostasy, will have received a mighty accession, or a powerful co-laborer in the unholy work of dwarfing the immortal mind, of tyrannizing over the sacred rights of conscience, and of torturing the bodies and damning the souls of men. God forbid that that day, or night rather, should ever

spread its horrid pall and moral death over the land! That night will never come! The march of Protestantism, "terrible as an army with banners," is onward, onward! and, as Jehovah's chosen instrumentality, will yet pour the light of salvation upon earth's benighted millions in Heathen, and in Mohammedan, and in Roman Catholic lands, and bring them forth from their idolatry, and superstition, and slavery, and mental anguish, "regenerated and sanctified;" and the world shall be filled with her happy sons and daughters, free indeed, and with the knowledge of the glory of God shining in the face of Jesus Christ.*

The Church of Rome is Corrupt.

This follows as a necessary sequence from what has just been demonstrated.

The Church of Rome, being idolatrous, intolerant, persecuting, and blood-thirsty, *must be corrupt*. But, as the reader, doubtless, has already drawn this conclusion, I shall pass on to show that in many other things she is corrupt, and gives unmistakable evidence that she is the Man of Sin.

Popes have taught that they are not bound by their own solemn oaths, and have annulled or violated them at will.

Pascal II., in a contest with the Emperor Henry V., was overcome and taken prisoner. He made a solemn

* All who receive, and "build" on *Jesus Christ* as the only *meritorious cause* of our salvation; and who believe that *faith in Him*—a faith that "*purifies the heart and works by love*"—is the only *instrumental cause* of pardon and of salvation, and who have that faith, I recognize as Christians, children of God—the Church. Names signify but little, and are utterly worthless where these are wanting.

covenant with Henry, confirming it with an oath. The oath was taken under most solemn circumstances: the sacrifice of the mass was offered up, and as the Pope gave to Henry the consecrated wafer, he said: "*As this part of the living body is divided, so let him be divided from the kingdom of Christ and of God, who shall attempt to violate this covenant.*" Pascal violated this oath; and with his "holy" cardinals in the Council of Benius, declared it null and void. Here are the words of the Council:

"We all in this sacred Council, assembled with our lord the Pope, in accordance with the decisions of the Holy Spirit, condemn it (the covenant) with canonical censure, and by ecclesiastical authority. *We decide that it is null and void. We annihilate its binding force; and, that it may be utterly destitute of authority and power, we utterly excommunicate it.*"

Thus a Roman Catholic writes of this corrupt and nefarious transaction :*

"Now, the head of the Church suffers himself to be accused of double dealing. He retires to Terracina to weep over his sin! He suffers the cardinals to annul his decrees and promises. He is going (he says) to abdicate the tiara. Happily this purpose is opposed; and such is the docility of the pontiff, that he consents with resignation to retain the power, so that he may have the opportunity to make the better use of it. Finally, in a Council, he revoked the treaty which he had the misfortune to subscribe." *Infallibility*:

Paul IV., in 1555, entered into a solemn obligation, in the holy conclave, to secure his election, to make only four cardinals. He violated it, and proclaimed that the supreme head of the Church "*could not be bound, or his authority limited by an oath.*" Bungener

* Daunou.

says he was "a poor old creature whose head had been turned on mounting St. Peter's throne."* But he was infallible.

Councils and theologians have taught the same doctrine.

Popes, Councils, and theologians, have taught that *no faith is to be kept with heretics*; and Popes, wielding the power of the Church, have carried this Satanic doctrine into practice, by absolving subjects from their oath of allegiance, and by war and bloodshed.

Gregory VII. asserted, that as he had "the power of the keys to bind and loose, he had authority to dissolve the oath of fealty." Urban, in 1090, declared that subjects "are by no authority bound to observe the fealty which they swear to a Christian prince, who withstands God and the Saints, and contemns their precepts." Gregory IX., in 1229, taught that "none should keep faith with the persons who oppose God and the Saints." Urban VI., in 1378, averred that "engagements of any kind, even when confirmed by an oath, with persons guilty of schism or heresy, though made before their apostasy, are in themselves unlawful and void." Innocent X. taught that "the Roman Pontiff could invalidate civil contracts, promises or oaths, made by the friends of Catholicism with the patrons of heresy." Paul IV., Paul V., Clement VII., and a host of others, have taught and sanctioned this unholy doctrine.

No less than six general Councils have solemnly promulgated such antichristian ethics—two of Lateran, Lyons, Pisa, Constance, and Basil. Several of

He was 83 years old.

them not only taught this doctrine, but abrogated contracts and engagements, and annulled, or declared void, oaths of fealty. The fourth Council of Lateran, in 1215, decreed that "the subjects of such sovereigns as embrace heresy are freed from their fealty." The General Council of Lyons passed a similar, or if possible a more wicked decree, and absolved Frederic's subjects from their oath of allegiance.

"The General Council of Constance, on this topic, outstripped all competition, and gained an infamous celebrity in recommending and exemplifying treachery, the demolition of oaths, and unfaithfulness to engagements. The holy assembly having convicted John, though a lawful Pope, of simony, schism, heresy, infidelity, perjury, murder, fornication, adultery, rape, incest, sodomy, and a few other trifling frailties of a similar kind, deposed his holiness, and emancipated all Christians from their oath of obedience to his supremacy. His Infallibility in the meantime, notwithstanding his simony, schism, heresy, perjury, murder, incest, and sodomy, exercised his prerogative of dissolving oaths as well as the Council. The holy fathers had sworn to conceal from the pontiff their plans for his degradation. The trusty prelacy, however, notwithstanding their obligation to secrecy, revealed all, during the night, to his Holiness. John, by this means, had the satisfaction of discovering the machinations of his judges, and of inducing the infallible bishops to perjury. The pontiff, however, by his sovereign authority, and by the power of the keys, soon disannulled these obligations, and delivered the perjured traitors who composed the sacred synod from their oath of secrecy. The Pontiff showed the Council that he could demolish oaths as well as his accusers.

"Bailly, in the class-book used in Maynooth, teaches that 'the Church has a power of dispensing in vows and oaths.' This the author attempts to show from the words of Revelation, which confer the prerogative of the keys in binding and loosing, and which, he concludes, being general, signify not only the power of absolving from sin, but also from promises and oaths."*

* Edgar's Variations.

Dens, in his theology, now the most popular standard, perhaps, in the Church of Rome, says:

"The superior, as the vicar of God in the place of God, remits to a man the debt of a plighted promise. * * * * It is dispensed in God's name." He furthermore teaches that "a confessor should assert his ignorance of the truths which he knows only by sacramental confession, and confirm his assertion, if necessary, by oath. Such facts he is to conceal, though the life or safety of a man or the destruction of the State, depended on the disclosure. The confessor," he says, "is questioned and answers as a man. This truth, however, he knows not as man but as God"! "

Aquinas, Cajetan, Bernard, etc., etc., teach this "doctrine of devils." Aquinas says, "When a king is excommunicated for apostasy, his vassals are, in fact, immediately freed from his dominion and from their oath of fealty: for a heretic cannot govern the faithful." "A debtor," says Bernard, "though sworn to pay, may refuse the claim of a creditor who falls into heresy or under excommunication. The debtor's oath implies the tacit condition that the creditor to be entitled to payment should remain in a state in which communication with him would be lawful"! "

"Eugenius IV., in 1444, induced Ladislaus, king of Hungary, to break his treaty with the Sultan Amurath, though confirmed by the solemn oaths of the king and the sultan on the Gospel and the Koran. His Holiness, on this occasion, introduced a variety into the system established for the encouragement of perjury, by executing his plan by proxy. Julian, clothed with legatine authority, mustered all his eloquence to effect the design; and represented, in strong colors, the criminality of observing a treaty, so prejudicial to the public safety and so inimical to the holy faith. The pontiff's vicegerent, in solemn mockery, dispensed with the oath, which, being sworn with infidels, was, like those with heretics, a mere nullity. 'I absolve you,' said the representative of the representative of God,

‘from perjury, and I sanctify your arms. Follow my footsteps in the path of glory and salvation. Dismiss your scrupulosity, and devolve on my head the sin and the punishment.’ The sultan, it is said, displayed a copy of the violated treaty, the monument of papal perfidy, in the front of battle, implored the protection of the God of truth, and called aloud on the prophet Jesus to avenge the mocker of his religion and authority. The faith of Islamism excelled the casuistry of Popery. The perjurers, whom Moreri calls Christians, ‘falsified their oath,’ took arms against the Turks, and were defeated on the plains of Varna.”* Ladislaus was slain and a large portion of his army.

The subjects of Henry VIII. and of Queen Elizabeth were absolved from their oaths of allegiance. Henry IV., of Germany, was not only excommunicated, but Gregory VIII., to show himself a god and make the emperor’s humiliation and ruin complete, swept away his dominions and subjects with a single sentence: “*I absolve all Christians from the obligations of the oath which they have taken or shall take to him, and I forbid any one to obey him as king*”! Verily, “he spake as a dragon.” Gregory is a canonized saint before whom the Romanists of this land bow the knee!

Popes, and Councils, and theologians teach, and the faithful reduce the precept to practice, that *the goods of heretics may of right be confiscated*. Kings are dethroned and their dominions given to another. The wealthy are seized and immured in the dungeons of the Inquisition, and their property taken to enrich the “Holy Office.”† There are thousands of instances on record of persons of wealth, against whom no crime could be

* Edgar’s Variations.

† Several rules of the Inquisition, the reader will recollect, have reference to confiscation.

alleged, in some cases exemplary Romanists, who have been imprisoned and burned alive, through avarice and revenge. Can anything be more at variance with the holy precepts of the Bible? Can anything be more profoundly corrupt? Any people, much less a professing Church, who, in precept or practice, can receive or entertain for a moment such a "doctrine of devils," have certainly found the lowest deep in the "horrible pit" of depravity. And then to promulgate and practice this robbery—piracy—in the name of God and religion, language fails, utterly fails, to describe its enormity, and fancy to portray its hideousness.

The Celibacy of the Priests, and the Confessional, are a cause and means of corruption.

From the extreme delicacy of this subject and the brief space for its discussion, it will be impossible to give the reader a glimpse of its profound depths and dark windings, and almost illimitable extent. A full view, however, a thorough exhibition, would freeze him with horror, and, with damnable plots and murdered innocence, thrill his heart with anguish. The record is with Him before whom nothing is hid, and that day, "for which all other days were made," will reveal all.

Of the law of celibacy, as in contravention of the law of God, as emphatically made known in nature and Revelation, I do not purpose to speak, except in its effects as seen in and through the confessional.

I will give, first of all, the confessions of a French Priest, who, after struggling against the temptations constantly thrown in his way, in the confessional, and surveying the corruptions around him from this source, became convinced that "Mother Church" is the great

apostasy, and turned him to the pure Gospel preached by Protestants.

“It is not my intention,” he says, “to repeat here all the accusations so justly made against Catholic Priests, but only to reveal, to publish in the light, perhaps for the first time, how they defraud the poor deluded people who trust to them. I am bold to say aloud, that Protestants have nothing yet upon this important matter so precise as what I am about to say. I have confessed priests and laymen of every description, a bishop (once), superiors, curates, persons high and low, women, girls, boys. I am, therefore, fitted to speak of the confessional.

“The confession of men is a matter of high importance *in political matters*, to *impress their minds with slavish ideas*; but, not to repeat what I have already stated on this subject in my discourse, I refer the reader to it. As for other matters, confessors endeavor to give a high opinion of their own holiness to fathers and husbands, that they may be induced to send to the confessional, without any fear, their wives and daughters; because, doubtless, should fathers and husbands know what passes at the confession-box between the holy man and their wives and daughters, they never would permit them again to go to these schools of vice. But priests command most carefully to women never to speak of their confession to men, and they inquire severally about that in every confession.

“The confession of the female sex is the great triumph, the most splendid theatre of priests. Here is completed the work which is but begun through all their intercourse with women; for all our relations with them begin from their birth and continue till their death. In their baptism we sprinkle their heads with holy water, at their death their grave; and the space comprised between those two epochs is filled by a thousand ecclesiastical duties. The more I think of this matter, the more I remember this sentence: ‘*Priests, in taking the vows of renouncing marriage, engage themselves to take the wives of others.*’

“So soon as the first light of reason has appeared in their tender minds, we have girls at our confessional; and here, with all the resources of cunning and lessons of theology, we sow the seeds of our future power in their hearts, the foundation of our future designs

Those young girls, from seven years of age, come and kneel with all the innocence, the purity, the inexperience of childhood—beautiful as the lilies of the valley, of which our Saviour speaks in the Gospel; they come, sent by their mothers, by the orders of the priest, who watches his prey with eager eyes; they come with all the fear and respect of their age for the man of God. He, seeing in them the future tools of his passions, fills their minds with prejudices, repeats to them that he is the minister of heaven, that they must look to him, revere him, almost worship him as a God; he accustoms their mind to obey him absolutely and blindly, to believe him infallible—in short, a divine oracle. Thus he gives to their thoughts the direction he pleases: he prepares his batteries; he informs them upon subjects which they ought never to know. At first they do not understand those lessons at so early an age; but by-and-bye they bear their fruit when developed by time. Thus confessors instruct those girls from seven, or even six, years of age; for the youngest are the best. At ten years old they come to catechism. In those long instructions he explains diffusely, three or four times a week, the vileness and filthiness in that shameful book, which they learn by heart. As a preparation to the Lord's Supper, at the end of their year of catechism, he confesses them much oftener than usual; they make a general *review* of their whole life. When he gives them the absolution which purifies their conscience and reconciles them to God, he reveals to their mind what they owe to their confessor for such a favor. In the afternoon of this same day, at one of the most gorgeous ceremonies of the Catholic Church, the general communion of boys, the confessors, at the renovation of the vows of baptism strictly commands them not to neglect the holy confession, for *if they do they will be lost*. Thus young girls, well indoctrinated and bound to their confessor, are not heedless enough to abandon his orders; they come again to the confessional, through custom and habit, with the same simplicity, and entertaining the same respect and fear of their spiritual father, as in their childhood; they kneel many times in the vestry, without the confessional, before a man inflamed with passions—a man, perhaps, who has for a long time fought against himself, and who yet bears evil in his heart; before a man, perhaps, who has long since prepared his work, and now is ready to profit by it; before a man, honest and pure, perhaps, at

first, but who being a *man*, a son of Adam, may not be able to resist the temptation. And I ask, is it possible, humanly speaking, for him, a priest, to remain pure, when at twenty-five or thirty years of age he is either *shut* in the *vestry* or in the *confessional* with a *young woman who reveals to him the secrets of her heart as she knows them herself*, according to our rules, so that he, the spiritual physician, may be able to *see and to judge*—with a woman who, being herself human, and not an angel, *speaks for hours to a young priest of her temptations, her passions, her secret thoughts, &c.*? I say, is it possible for human virtue to keep itself pure, not only for a day, a week, a month, but during years, and for the whole life?

“Let not a Catholic say to me, that these are the reasonings of a corrupt man, of a bad priest; let him not say that God can do what man cannot; and other similar reasons which, *I know it well*, priests always give to explain their pretended virtue. Those reasons a common Catholic may be satisfied with; but I, a priest, cannot be. No; I cannot; I know too well the matter; and I answer, first, that I was no more inclined to *evil*, nor more liable to yield to temptation, than others—(for God knows that I never seduced any one through my ministry). I was only a man, like others, designed by the Creator for connubial happiness according to his word itself: ‘It is not good for man to be alone; I will make a helpmeet for him;’ designed, I say, for a union intended by the all-wise and benevolent Creator. Can the laws of Popery prevail over the wisdom of the Almighty? Let not a Catholic say that a priest in this situation is helped by the special grace of God; for I answer, by the words of Christ himself: ‘Whosoever loves danger, he shall perish in it.’ And if God has promised his grace, it is not granted in an *unnatural, immoral situation, directly against His institution*.

“As soon as the young girl—for I speak peculiarly of their confession—enters the confessional, ‘Bless me, father,’ she says, kneeling, and crossing herself, ‘for I have sinned:’ and the priest mumbles: ‘*Dominus sit in ore tuo et in corde, tuo ut confitearis omnia peccata tua.*’ ‘The Lord be in your heart and lips, that you may confess all your sins.’ If she is an ugly, common country girl, or woman, she is soon dispatched: but, on the contrary, if she is pretty and fair, the holy father puts himself at ease; he examines her in the most secret recesses of her soul; he unfolds her mind in every sense, in

every manner, upon every matter. This is the way which *theology* recommends us to follow in our interrogatories: '*Daughter, have you had bad thoughts?*' '*On what subject?*' '*How often?*' &c. '*Have you had bad desires? What desires?*' '*Have you committed bad actions?*' '*With whom? What actions?*' I am obliged to stop. Many times the poor ashamed girl does not dare answer the questions, they are so indecent. In that case, the holy man, ceasing his interrogations, says to her: '*Listen, daughter, to the true doctrine of the Church: you must confess the truth, all the truth, to your spiritual father. Do you know that I am in the place of God—that you cannot deceive Him? Speak, then; reveal your heart to me, as God knows it; you will be very glad when you will have discharged this burden from your mind. Will you not?*' '*Yes.*' '*Begin; I will help you;*' and then begins such a diabolical explanation as is not to be found but in houses of infamy, I suppose, or in our theological books. This is so well known, that I have often heard of wicked young men saying to each other, '*Come, let us go to confession, and the curate will teach us a great many corrupt things which we never knew;*' and many young girls have told me in confession that, in order to become acquainted with details on these matters pleasing to their corrupt nature, they went purposely to the confessional, to speak about it to their spiritual father. Sometimes I have heard the confessions of young girls, not above sixteen years of age, who explained to me such disgusting things, with a precision, a propriety (or, rather, impropriety) of terms, that, when I asked them where they had gathered all this strange learning, they seemed as much astonished at my question as I was at their confession, and said to me: '*Why, father, our former confessor taught us all this, and commanded us never to omit these details, otherwise we should be damned.*' I replied to them: '*I pray you never use such again; they are unworthy of a Christian mouth; you misunderstood your confessor.*' I learned afterwards that those misguided persons left my confessional because, they said, I was an ignorant confessor, *who did not confess like others, and who did not cause them to say all.*

"After so many instructions, the young girl is well indoctrinated, well fitted to answer either the *questions* or the *purposes* of the priest. This poison infused in her heart soon infects her whole mind and destroys her purity. It is precisely at such a point of time

that her cruel foe waits for her. When he sees that she is made vicious and corrupt by the teachings of the confessional, he is sure of his success."

This testimony is confirmed by Blanco White, Hogan, and every priest who has been converted and has written on this subject. They assure us, indeed, that the half has not been told us—that the "whole degradation is *unknown*."* Escaped nuns tell the same sad story. Laymen have proclaimed the same. And Bishop Kenrick, in a recent work, not only corroborates it, but admits, that in many instances the confessional has been a means of seduction and corruption. Hear him:

"We scarcely dare to speak concerning that atrocious crime in which the *office of hearing confession* is perverted to the ruin of souls by impious men under the influence of their lusts. Would that we could regard it solely as a conception of the mind and as something *invented* by the enemies of the faith for the purpose of slander! But it is not fit that we should be ignorant of the decrees which the Pontiffs have issued to defend the sacredness of this sacrament."[†]

In the decrees of the Pontiffs, to which the bishop alludes, no less than nineteen different ways are specified, in which a priest may seduce, or attempt to seduce the confessing female in the confessional!

Now, can that be a sacrament of the institution of God, in the practice of which men and women are necessarily placed in a position and under circumstances the most tempting to an indulgence of the worst pas-

* "Dens' Theology" abounds with directions in obscene language touching this very subject. Were I to give a translation, modest men, much more women, would be utterly disgusted. I have never seen or heard the like.

† Quoted and translated by Dr. Beecher.

sions of human nature: and the tendency and effects of which are only corrupt and corrupting?

At the Council of Trent some of the secular princes and some of the clergy drew most graphic pictures of the corruptions of the priesthood and of the people, and urged with earnest importunity a reform. Celibacy and the confessional were known to be the cause and means of that corruption. Says Edgar—and Sarpi and Pallavicini both admitted that sad statements and urgent appeals were made in reference to this matter,—

“Albert, Duke of Bavaria, in 1562, by Augustine, his ambassador, depicted in glowing colors, before the Council of Trent, the licentiousness of the German priesthood. The contagion of heresy, the ambassador said, had, on account of sacerdotal profligacy, pervaded the people of Bavaria, even to the nobility. A recital of clerical criminality would wound the ear of chastity. Debauchery had covered the ecclesiastics with infamy. A hundred priests, so general was the contagion, could hardly muster three or four who obeyed the injunctions of chastity. The French applauded the ambassador’s speech.”

“The Emperor Ferdinand, though without success, applied to the Pope, in 1564, for a repeal of the laws against sacerdotal matrimony. Maximilian also, with many of the German princes, importuned Pius IV. for the same purpose. The reason urged by the emperor was the profligacy of the priesthood. His majesty declared that among many of the clergy scarcely one could be found who lived in chastity. All, with hardly an exception, were public fornicators, to the great danger of souls and scandal of the people. A repeal of clerical celibacy, Maximilian stated, would gratify the populace of Bavaria, Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, Austria, Carinthia, Carniola, and Hungary. All these vast regions would have rejoiced in the restoration of marriage among the clergy.

“The emperor’s application was supported by the Popish Priesthood of Germany. These, in maintenance of their petition, alleged

various reasons. The frailty of man; the difficulty of abstinence; the strength of the passion that prompts to marriage; the permission of clerical wedlock by the Old and New Testament under the Jewish and Christian dispensations; its use, with few exceptions, by the Apostles; the instructions of Dionysius to Pinytus; the decision of the Nicene Council, suggested by Paphnitius; the usage of the Greeks and Latins in the east and west till the popedom of Calixtus—all these arguments the German ecclesiastics urged for the lawfulness of sacerdotal matrimony. A second reason the Germans deduced from clerical profligacy. Fifty priests, then, these churchmen confessed, could with difficulty afford one who was not a notorious fornicator, to the offence of the people and the injury of piety. Sacerdotal logic and learning, however, were unavailing when weighed against pontifical policy and ecclesiastical utility."

The following are some, among many other reasons, given by Popes and Jesuits, against clerical matrimony. I desire that the reader, on many accounts, weigh them well:

"Cardinal Rodolf, arguing in a Roman consistory in favor of clerical celibacy, affirmed that the priesthood, if allowed to marry, would *transfer their attachment from the Pope to their family and prince*; and this would tend to the injury of the ecclesiastical community. The holy see, the cardinal alleged, would by this means be soon limited to the Roman city. The Transalpine party in the Council of Trent used the same argument. The introduction of priestly matrimony, this faction urged, would sever the clergy from their close dependence on the popedom, and turn their affections to their family, and consequently to their king and country. Marriage connects men with their sovereign and with the land of their nativity. Celibacy, on the contrary, transfers the attention of the clergy from his majesty and the State to his Holiness and the Church. The man who has a wife and children is bound by conjugal and fraternal attachment to his country, and feels the warmest glow of paternal love mingled with the flame of patriotism. His interests and affections are entwined with the honor and prosperity of his native land; and this, in consequence, he will prefer to the aggrandizement of the

Romish hierarchy or the grandeur of the Roman pontiff. The dearest objects of his heart are embraced in the soil that gave them birth, the people among whom they live, and the government that affords them protection. Celibacy, on the contrary, precludes all these engagements, and directs the undivided affections of the priesthood to the Church and its ecclesiastical sovereign. The clergy become dependent on the Pope rather than on the king, or State, and endeavor to promote the prosperity of the Papacy rather than their country. *Such are not linked with the State by an offspring whose happiness is involved in the prosperity of the nation.*"*

What, then, shall we say of the hundreds of priests in this country who are not even bound to the soil, the State, by nativity? Their allegiance is to a spiritual and temporal prince in Europe, and their affections are there.

Facts, stubborn, well-attested facts, sustain the testimony of converted priests and escaped nuns—that the confessional is a means of corruption.

The city of Rome, the city of churches, and cardinals, and bishops, and priests—the home of his Holiness, the fountain of infallibility, *is the most corrupt city in Christendom.* There is one ecclesiastic to every thirty-six inhabitants, and *over one-third of the children born there are illegitimate.*

The Rev. Dr. Murray reports the following conversation which he held with a citizen of Rome, in the Sistine Chapel, but a few years since:

“ ‘What,’ said I to a friend, who knows them well, ‘what is the moral character of these cardinals?’ His reply astounded me. ‘It is to me amazing,’ said he, ‘that some of these men can keep up even the form of devotion in the presence of one another, when each knows that the other keeps three, four, or five mistresses. Some of

* Edgar's Variations.

them are the greatest debauchees in Rome; they go from the bed to the altar, and from the altar to the bed. I know what I say. I have mixed and mingled with these persons. I have heard wicked and loose young men talk in my day; but the most loose and lewd conversation I ever heard in my life was from these men. Noble Romans have told me with tears in their eyes, that, because of the lewdness of these priests, and their way of ferreting out everything at the confessional, they have lost confidence in the virtue of their wives, their mothers, their sisters, and their daughters."

This is the sad state of things all over Italy. His late Holiness, Gregory XVI., who in 1832 announced to the world that the Church could not err, lived with a woman not his wife, and left two daughters behind him! Human life, as well as character, is at a sad discount in the "Holy City;" assassinations are almost of nightly occurrence. Spain is a restless mass of corruption. Mexico has sunk almost beneath redemption. And in every country in which the Church of Rome holds undisputed sway, where her false doctrines and corrupt practices work their legitimate results, the priests and people are corrupt, and can but be corrupt. Celibacy and the confessional, if nothing else, will keep them so. "Wherever we meet Popery," says Wylie, "there we meet moral degradation, mental imbecility, indolence, improvidence, rags, and beggary. No ameliorations of government*—no genius or peculiarities of race—no fertility of soil—no advantages of climate, seem able to withstand the baleful influence of this destructive superstition. It is the same amid the exhaustless resources of the New World as amid the civilization and arts of the old—it is the same amid

* In what country has Popery ameliorated government? Can the friends of this enemy of man tell me?

the grandeurs of Switzerland and the historic glories of Italy, as among the bogs of Connaught and the wilds of the Hebrides."

Now, if the Protestant clergy of this enlightened land and day, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists, the most high-minded, honorable, pure class of men in the world—men in whose integrity, and piety, and holy zeal for the cause and glory of God, I have implicit confidence—if they were to bow their necks to the law of celibacy, and take this unnatural vow, and establish confessionals all over the land, and each were to hear the private confessions, day after day, of all his charge; if lovely young ladies were to go, each alone, and kneel before them and tell all their desires, emotions, temptations and acts—desires sometimes towards the very minister to whom she is confessing—and if everything said and done in the confessional, were to be kept a profound secret, upon the pain of fearful anathemas, the Inquisition and eternal death—God is my judge,—in less than twelve months my confidence would be shaken in many, very many of them, if not all. Men, ministers, are not angels; and when they voluntarily place themselves in a position and under influences of evil, they have no promise of the grace of God to sustain them. They must fall. So is it with Roman Catholic priests. They are naturally as good as other men—no better, however—and doubtless many of them enter the priesthood with good desires and purposes, but alas! temptation, which lives in the very atmosphere they breathe, meets them at every turn, and enters their hearts by a thousand avenues, overcomes them, and they fall.

They may rise—God help them!—but they fall again. “Young women,” says White, “kneel before them in all the intimacy and openness of confession. * * * Love, long resisted, seizes them at length like madness. Two, I knew, who died insane. Hundreds might be found who avoid that fate by a life of settled, systematic vice.”

“Vice is a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be *hated* needs but to be *seen* ;
But *seen too oft*, familiar with her face,
We first *pity*, then ENDURE, then EMBRACE.”

The Church of Rome, then, is corrupt, deeply, fearfully, foully corrupt. And this carries us down to the last stage in her fall, in the working of the mystery of iniquity ; and, as we stand surrounded by gloom, and corruption, and moral death, we see, and feel, and know that she is the *Great Apostasy*. The evidence is as clear and as overwhelming from her practice as from her doctrines. “The tree is known by its fruits.” The Church of Rome is *idolatrous, intolerant, persecuting, blood-thirsty, and corrupt*.

CHAPTER V.

SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

Spiritual Supremacy.

As the Church of Rome departed from the pure faith and holy practice of the Apostolic Church, she arrogated to herself more and more *spiritual* and *temporal supremacy*. Her claim, indeed, to universal spiritual and temporal authority has been in almost exact ratio with her decline and revelation as the Man of Sin. The Apostle had so announced, and his prediction has been fulfilled to the very letter. The falling away—the revelation as the Man of Sin—the opposing of God—the exaltation above God and above all that is worshipped, have followed each other almost as cause and effect. And when she had reached the lowest deep in her false doctrines and her corrupt practice, she reached the highest point in her exaltation, and assumed claim to be as God, and above God. To trace fully the history of her unparalleled decline and proud exaltation would be a profitable, but a melancholy task. This, in part, has been done in the preceding discussion. I purpose now to glance at and refute her claim to spiritual and temporal supremacy. And the former, in its importance and logical connection, first:

That the Pope, as the supreme head and impersona-

tion of the Church of Rome, *claims* spiritual supremacy, is not an open question. All, in and out of her pale, admit that such a claim is set up. A wide difference of opinion, however, exists among Popes, and Councils, and theologians, as to the nature and extent of the spiritual authority of the Pontiff. No less than four theories are earnestly advocated by as many parties.* The Church is, notwithstanding, *infallible* and a *unit*!

“One party confers a mere presidency; and the second an unlimited sovereignty on the Roman Pontiff. The third makes the Pope equal—and the fourth superior, to God.”

Cardinal Filaster and the Council of Constance, Du Pin and Paolo, with many others, maintain that the Pope “is only the first among the bishops;” that he “is chief, not in *authority*, but in *order*, as the president of an assembly;” that he has the “first place,” and that a general Council is superior to him. The Gallican Church, in the days of her power and glory, adopted and advocated this theory. But Bossuet, and Fénelon, and Du Pin, have departed, and on none has their mantle fallen. Not a single great name now advocates it. It is dead. The despot, Pius IX., and the despot, Napoleon III., have buried it beyond the hope of a resurrection.

The second theory maintains that the Pope is a sovereign, in the place of Jesus Christ on earth, possessing, because delegated by Him, unlimited power. “He is clothed,” says Edgar, “with uncontrolled authority over the Church, the clergy, Councils, and kings. He

* The advocates of each theory split into many shades of difference.

has a right, both in a legislative and executive capacity, to govern the universal Church, and to ordain, judge, suspend, and depose bishops, metropolitans and patriarchs, throughout Christendom. These receive their authority from the Pope, as he receives his from God. He possesses a superiority over general Councils, which, for legitimation and validity, require pontifical convocation, precedency and ratification. He is the supreme judge of controversy, and, in this capacity, receives appeals from the whole Church. His chief prerogative is infallibility." He cannot err, because he is in the place of God, and as God. Binius, Bellarmine, Cajetan, Lainez, Bonaventura, &c., &c., and Gregory VII., Boniface VIII., and Paul IV., and a hundred other Popes, with the whole fraternity of the Jesuits, and the Ultramontane party, maintain this dogma. It is the doctrine of this fallen Church throughout the world at this day.

The Jesuits, with Lainez and Bellarmine at their head, teach that the Pope is equal to and above God. Innocent III. says: "The Pope holds the place of the true God." "The Pope and the Lord," it is affirmed, "form the same tribunal, so that, sin excepted, the Pope can do all that God can do." "He possesses," says Durand, "a plenitude of power, and none dare say to him, any more than to God: Lord, what doest thou? He can change the nature of things, or make nothing out of something and something out of nothing."* Lainez taught that he "has the power of dispensing with all laws, and the same authority as the Lord." Bellarmine says: "The Pope can *transub-*

* Quoted by Edgar.

stantiate sin into duty, and duty into sin." The canon law, to which, as I have shown, every Romanist in this country subscribes, says: "The Pope, in the plenitude of his power, *is above right*, can change the substantial nature of things, and transform *unlawful into lawful*, and *dispense with right*."* And "Stephen, Archbishop of Petraca, in his senseless parasitism and blasphemy, declared, in the Council of Lateran, that Leo possessed '*power above all powers, both in heaven and in earth.*'"†

Unlimited spiritual supremacy, then, is claimed by the Roman Pontiff, and by the Roman Catholic Church in and through him as her head. This supremacy, it is affirmed, is of divine appointment, and is taught in, and sustained by, the infallible Word of God. Hence it follows, it is further affirmed, that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church, and that out of her pale there is no salvation. I repudiate the claim and deny every affirmation. I have already demonstrated that she is fallen and corrupt—is the great apostasy. I propose now to show that her claim to supremacy is without scriptural warrant—is a fallacy.

The advocates of this doctrine have fully relied on the language of our Saviour to Peter to sustain it:

"And I say also unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."‡

This text has occasioned a world of controversy, and has been a common battle-field ever since the bishops

* See Edgar, p. 159. He gives, in a note, the original. † Ibid.

‡ Matthew xvi. 18.

of Rome assumed to be the successors of St. Peter, and head and lord of Christ's visible Church. It is admitted by Popes and theologians, that if this passage does not sustain their claim, it has no solid foundation in the Scriptures. It is as groundless, then, as a correct exegesis will show,

"As the baseless fabric of a vision."

The whole controversy, except the transmission of power, turns upon the meaning of the term "*rock*." Does this term "*rock*" refer to and mean Peter? The advocates of papal supremacy affirm it does. This is their exposition. The Church of the living God, then, is built upon a mere man. Does the term *rock* refer to, and mean Christ? We affirm it does. This is the Protestant view. The Church, then, is built upon Christ, the Lord; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The context throws light upon this text, and will materially aid us in arriving at the truth. Indeed, it is, in part, the key that unlocks its meaning. "Jesus asked the disciples, '*Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?*' And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, *That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,*" &c.

The object of the Saviour, it must be clear to every mind, was to draw out the confession from the disciples that he was the Messiah, the "foundation stone" that God had promised to "lay in Zion." * When Peter, speaking for all the rest, had confessed this, He replied to him, and through him to the others, "Upon *this rock* I will build my Church." The *rock*, Peter had confessed Christ to be, and not Peter, who was not the subject of conversation, and, I believe, never in this connection and sense, entered into the thoughts of Jesus or his disciples. If the conversation had been about Simon and the name Jesus had given him, Peter, a stone, and the Saviour had said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," &c., some doubt might have been left on the mind as to whom the rock would have referred. But even then, the tenor of Scripture would have demanded a better exegesis, one in conformity with itself. By the rock, then, the Saviour must have meant himself. This preserves the connection, the sense, and confirms the confession of Peter.

"When we come to look at the parts of the verse more closely, we are further strengthened in this conclusion. If Christ had meant to say, "thou art Peter, and on *thee* will I build my Church," why did he not say so? This would have been explicit and free from all ambiguity, and would, moreover, have suggested the play on the words as much as the present form. Or, if he meant that Peter should be the Rock, why did he not use the exact form of his name, and address him as such? The natural form of expressing such a thought would have been, "thou art Petros, and on thee, the Petroa, I will build my Church." But, instead of this, he changes the pronoun of the second person, for one of the third, as if to say, "I am no longer speaking to *you*, but speaking of *another*;" and changes the

* See Isaiah xxviii. 16.

masculine *πέτρος*, for the feminine *πέτρα*, and inserts the demonstrative pronoun *ταύτη*, of the third person, instead of the personal pronoun *σὺ*, of the second person. Why these changes, if he meant the same person? Why change the gender, the number, the case, and the word itself, if he designed to refer to the person he had just spoken of? If it be replied, as it sometimes is, that Christ used the Syriac *Kepha*, and that no such distinction exists in that language as in the Greek, this will not remove the difficulty, for why should Matthew then make this distinction? Does not this very fact prove, that, knowing the possibility of this misinterpretation, the Evangelist sought to prevent it by adopting this change of person, and inserting the demonstrative *ταύτη*, as if to point us to a remoter antecedent than *πέτρον*? If it be said that *πέτρον* was changed for *πέτρα*, because the former means only a stone, or a part of a rock, while the latter means a rock itself, we reply, that this very fact is itself suggestive of the true interpretation. Peter was really only a part of the Rock, one of the living stones, and Christ only meant so to represent him, while he presents himself the immovable Rock of Ages, as the only true foundation for his Church. As the name *Petros* was so given because of the *petra*, and not the *petra* because of the *Petros*, so it was here. Peter having confessed the great fact of an incarnate Messiah, which was the Rock on which the Church rests, Christ suggests to him the fact, that he is a part of that Rock, a living stone that rests upon it, and then goes on to exhibit the design with which he drew out this confession, namely, to declare the other great fact, that the Church was to rest on an atoning Messiah as to its real, invisible foundation, and that it was by preaching this great doctrine that it was to be built up as a visible institute in the world. This interpretation rescues the passage from that aspect of disjointedness and superficiality that it has on the other interpretation, and brings out a climax worthy of the effort to draw out this confession, and makes Christ thus declare as his design in this drawing out, what was the real foundation on which the Church invisible rested, and what was to be that great doctrine by preaching which the Church visible was to be set up as an organization in the world. If we take Peter as the Rock, we have Christ first calling out the great doctrine of his Messianic character, then

descending to the comparatively trivial fact that Peter was to be one of the first preachers of this doctrine, then returning to the other great doctrine of the perpetuity of the Church, which has an obvious connection with the Rock, if Christ is that Rock, but none if Peter was; for, with all his boldness, stability was never a prominent trait of this great Apostle. To us, then, the one interpretation belittles and disjoins the passage, while the other makes it a noble and fitting expansion of the great doctrines on which the Church rests, invisibly, in the purpose of God, visibly, in its actual and historical development.

“If it be objected, that it is unnatural for Christ to address Peter and then give no more intimation than the words ‘on *this* rock,’ that he was speaking of himself, we reply, that even granting that there was no more intimation than this, the form of speech would not be unauthorized. ‘Destroy *this* temple,’ &c., is an instance in which he referred to himself, in a similar sentence, with much less intimation of the fact than is contained here. The use of the pronoun referring to the remoter rather than to the nearer antecedent, is too common in the New Testament to need any elaborate vindication here. See *αὐτοῦ* in John viii. 44, and others in Acts ii. 22, 23 · iii. 15, 16; 2 Thess. ii. 8, 9, &c., &c.

“If it be objected, as Alford does in his recent edition of the Greek Testament, that being a pillar, a foundation, &c., is always used of a person in the New Testament, and never of a doctrine, we might ask him what was meant when it is said in Heb. vi. 1, “Not laying again the *foundation* of repentance, &c., of the *doctrine* of baptisms,” &c.; (see also Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 11, 12, &c.;) but it is sufficient to remind him of the fact that Christ is a person, and that, therefore, this text would really be no exception to his remark. But there is another fact which he needs also to have brought to his notice, in regard to the naming of persons as foundations in the New Testament, that there is no case where a *single* person is named as the foundation of the Church, except Christ. And it is, perhaps, not unworthy of notice, that the verb here used is not *θεμελίω*, to lay a foundation, which would have described the act of Peter as a mere founder of the Church, or a part of the foundation, but the wider word *οικοδομέω*, to build a house, which describes a continuous

work, one which is still going on, and going on, not on the foundation, Peter, but on the Rock, Christ." *

Christ is declared to be, in the Old and New Testaments, the Rock on which the Church is built; her foundation, and the source of her life and peace, stability and power.

"He is the Rock, His work is perfect." "Then he forsook God who made him, and lightly esteemed *the Rock of his salvation.*" (Deut. xxxiii. 4, 15.) "Because thou hast forgotten the God of thy salvation, and hast not been mindful of *the Rock of thy strength.*" (Isaiah xvii. 10.) "Behold, I lay in Zion *for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation—he that believeth shall not make haste.*" (Isaiah xxviii. 16.) "*The stone* which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner." (Matt. xvi. 42.) "Be it known unto you all, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole. * * * * *This is the stone* which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other." (Acts iv. 10–12.) "For they stumbled at that stumbling-stone; as it is written, Behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling-stone, a Rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on Him shall not be confounded." (Rom. ix. 32, 33.) "To whom coming as unto a *living stone* disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious; ye also"—did not Peter embrace himself?—"as *lively stones* are built up a spiritual house." (1 Peter

* Quoted from the January number of the Quarterly Review of the M. E. Church, South, 1856, by the kind consent of the author, Rev. T. V. Moore.

ii. 4.) "For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them—and *that Rock was Christ.*" (1 Cor. x. 4.)

Christ, then, and not Peter, is *the Rock, the foundation* of His Church. This exposition preserves the harmony of Scripture; while that of Rome breaks it, and sounds a note of jarring discord. Peter the Rock, indeed! Peter—Pius IX.—the foundation and Lord of the Church of God!

But Christ is not only declared to be the Rock on which the Church is built, but the *only foundation of the Church and of the Apostles and Prophets.*

"*Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, WHICH IS JESUS CHRIST.*" (1 Cor. iii. 11.)

"Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are *built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom*"—Jesus—"all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord." (Eph. ii. 19–21.)

Now the Apostle teaches here, in this beautiful figure of the Church—her foundation—growth—unity—perpetuity—happiness—that the Apostles and prophets are not, in any sense, *her foundation*; that she is *not built on them, or on any one of them*, but on the *foundation of the Apostles and Prophets—Jesus Christ.* They are not a *foundation*, but *themselves rest on one*—Peter as well as James and Matthew, &c. Christ is the root of David. Can David, then, be any part of that root? The Church is "*built on the foundation of*"—not on the Apostles and Prophets, *being a foundation.* Peter, then, is not the foundation of the Church—is not the

Rock—but Christ Jesus the Lord. He reposed and built on Christ, not on himself, and is a living stone, with all true believers, in the “spiritual building” that “groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.”

Peter and the other Apostles never understood our Lord, in the text under review, to mean, by the term Rock, Peter; that the Church was to be built on him, and that he was clothed with spiritual supremacy. In all their conversations and labors, as detailed in the Gospels, in the Acts, and in the Epistles, no intimation of this kind is given, but constantly and everywhere the contrary. Peter was not above the other Apostles, in *order* or *office*, but only their equal. So they say; so the Holy Ghost teacheth. How shall we account for this, if the exposition of Rome be correct? To say the least of it, all the Apostles were derelict in duty—have kept back a momentous truth—cheated Peter out of his honors, who was totally ignorant of his position and authority, or who was a thousand times more submissive and humble than those who have claimed to be his successors for the last thousand years!

Finally, the exposition we have given is sustained by the earliest and most learned Fathers who have written upon this question, and by many able theologians and doctors of Rome.

Justin Martyr says:

“Christ bestowed on Simon the name of Peter, *because*, by the revelation of his heavenly Father, he *confessed Him* to be the Son of God.”

Augustine says:

“The Church is founded upon a rock, whence Peter derived his name. For the rock was not so called from Peter, but Peter

from the rock, just as Christ is not called from a Christian, but a Christian from Christ. Accordingly, the reason why our Lord said : 'Upon this I will build my Church,' was, because Peter had said : 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Upon this rock which thou hast confessed, he means to say, I will build my Church. For the Rock was Christ ; upon which foundation, Peter himself built, inasmuch as it is said : Other foundation can no man lay than what is laid—that is, Christ Jesus."

Cyprian, Cyril, Eusebius, and Athanasius, held the same view. Anselm, Lombard, Pole, Aquinas, and a host of others, able, honored sons of Rome, concur in this exposition. The acute, the learned Erasmus, was astonished "that any person would wrest the passage to signify the Roman Pontiff." The Councils of Nice and Constantinople held this interpretation. One member in the Council of Trent, Fraguas, asserted that the Church is built "on the *living Stone*, the *firm* and *divine Rock*." "Pope Hadrian, in a letter to the Empress Irene, read and received with acclamation in the second general Council of Nice, gave this interpretation. The same Pontiff's letter to Tarasius, containing a similar statement, was read in this synod, and admitted with equal approbation. A similar reception attended the letters of Germanicus, concurring with Hadrian, in this unerring assembly. All the bishops approved." A few other Popes, Celestine, Innocent, Leo, &c., have held the same doctrine.

I submit, then, to the candid reader, if the claim of the Roman Pontiffs to spiritual supremacy, based upon this text, is not utterly groundless. It rests upon a false interpretation—it is a fallacy. And this is the main pillar, the foundation-stone of the mighty superstructure. It is "airy nothing."

The text, "I will give unto thee the keys," equally fails them.

This passage, as I have shown, has reference simply to the preaching of the Gospel. The call of God to preach, is the power to loose and bind. And this, not absolutely, but as an ambassador, as an instrumentality: God binds and looses. And this power, as is clear from the New Testament, was conferred upon, and exercised by *all the Apostles* alike, and is now by all true, faithful ministers. The supremacy of Peter, then, is not indicated here. And Pius IX. has no authority, from this text, to lord it over the Church, and the consciences and souls of men. The Man of Sin was to *exalt himself* in the temple of God. His claim was to be, and is a human invention.

* But if it were demonstrated—albeit, this never can be—that Peter was the foundation and supreme head of the Church, it would remain to be demonstrated that he was bishop of Rome, or that he was ever at Rome. Was Peter Pope of Rome? Where is the proof? A question so momentous must have evidence to sustain it, as clear as the being of God, the divinity of Jesus, the heavenly origin of our holy religion. It would have been written by inspiration in lines of living light.

Gahan, a Roman Catholic Historian, whose history is now before me, says:

"St. James the Elder being appointed the particular bishop of Jerusalem, St. Peter removed his apostolic see to the city of Antioch, the capital of Syria and all the East, where the followers of Christ's doctrine were first distinguished by the name of Christians. They increased there amazingly, and formed a very numerous Church,

of which St. Evodius and St. Ignatius were the first bishops after the removal of St. Peter from Antioch to Rome; for this zealous apostle, not content with founding the great Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, resolved to set up the standard of the cross of Jesus Christ, in the very metropolis of the world. *Hence he went to Rome in the year of our Lord 42*, being the second year of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, and planted a very flourishing Church in that city, which he chose for the chief seat of his labors, and made his own particular see, and in that quality the capital of Christendom, and the first and most eminent of all other particular Churches, on account of the authority and preëminence of its chief pastor." "Though the Church of Rome was in a very flourishing condition before the arrival of St. Paul, it made such acquisitions by the labors and preaching of this Apostle, that he is considered, jointly with St. Peter, a principal founder of it. *Hence, St. Irenæus, in the following century, calls the Church of Rome the greatest and most ancient Church, founded and established by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.*" * * * "Nothing can be more incontestable in history, than that St. Peter was the founder and first bishop of the see of Rome. In this the concurring testimony of all ancient Christian writers, down from St. Ignatius, the disciple of this Apostle, is unanimous. Eusebius, the parent of Church history; St. Jerome; and the old Roman Calendar, published by Bucherius, say, that St. Peter held the see of Rome twenty-five years."* "It was from Rome that St. Peter wrote his two epistles to the converts he had made during the seven years he was bishop of Antioch. He indeed called that city *Babylon*, as St. John also does in the Apocalypse, because Rome was then the chief seat both of the Empire and of Pagan idolatry, as formerly Babylon had been, but as Babylon in Chaldea was at that time nothing but a heap of ashes,† the best interpreters by *Babylon* understand heathenish Rome."

This is all the evidence that can be adduced that

* This would make Peter's martyrdom to have taken place in 67.

† This is a mistake, the city of Babylon was not then a heap of ashes.

Peter was the first Pope of Rome; the only proof touching this point to support the mighty fabric of Papal supremacy. It is tradition and dogmatism; nothing more. Irenæus, in the close of the second century, or beginning of the third, says: "The Church of Rome" was "founded and established by the *two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul*." And this assertion, based on tradition, and without giving the least intimation that Peter was Pope of Rome and the supreme head of the Church throughout the world, is taken as proof that he was. It as clearly proves that Paul was: Indeed, the evidence is ten-fold stronger to prove that Paul was Pope of Rome, than that Peter was! Eusebius, though he follows him, is more indistinct and uncertain than Irenæus. He does not hint that Peter was supreme head of the Church—a Pope.* But I will lay before the reader an argument from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Moore, clear, convincing, and perfectly satisfactory in refutation of this tradition. It is just what I desire to have written, and I gladly adopt it:

"Was Peter the first bishop of Rome? We answer, most emphatically, no. There is not the slightest evidence of this fact; but rather the contrary.

"(1.) Peter was not a bishop of any Church at all, and could not be by the very nature of his office. The apostolic office was an itinerant superintendence, established by Christ for extraordinary purposes, and designed to be temporary in its character. This temporary character is proved by the fact, that one qualification of an Apostle was that he must have seen Christ, and thus be a witness

* See pp. 63, 82. "Peter *appears*," he says, "to have preached," &c., and coming to Rome was crucified. * * * After the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was the first that received the episcopate of Rome. Not one word concerning the primacy of Peter.

of the great fundamental fact of Christianity, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. (See Acts i. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 1, &c.) This general superintendency and itinerancy made it impossible for an Apostle to be the bishop of any particular Church; for the two offices were as incompatible as a general travelling agency for the Post Office Department of the United States, and the postmastership in a particular city.

"But, if the bishop of any particular Church, it would have been of a Jewish Church or Diocese, and not a Gentile; for we are informed expressly by Paul, that the apostleship of the circumcision was assigned to Peter. Hence, if bishop at all, it would have been of a Jewish Church, unless his province was changed; a fact of which there is not the shadow of proof.

"(2.) But if it had been possible for Peter to be the bishop of any particular Church, where is the proof that he was bishop of Rome?

"In the first place, it is by no means certain that Peter was ever at Rome. As this is a decisive point, if it be established in one way, it is necessary to examine carefully the evidence on which the opinion of Peter's residence at Rome rests, and we shall be amazed at the dwindling and vanishing character of it, as we try to seek out and grasp it. What, then, is the evidence on which it is believed that Peter was ever at Rome?

"There are one or two dates that can be fixed with tolerable certainty, and that will aid us in this investigation. It is commonly conceded, so universally, indeed, as to need no argument, that Peter was killed in the Neronian persecution. This, according to Tacitus, (*Annal.* xv. 44.) broke out A. D. 64; for it followed the burning of Rome immediately, which was July 19, A. D. 64; (*Ib.* xv. 41.) Here, then, is one fixed point from which to reckon backward. If Peter was at Rome at all, it was before A. D. 64. We have his history from the resurrection of Christ to the meeting of the Synod in Jerusalem, A. D. 50, very fully, and not a word is said of his having visited Rome. Had he done so, we would surely have some hint of it; and the utter absence of all allusion to it proves that it was not done. We reach another step of evidence from the epistle to the Romans, written A. D. 58. There is no allusion to Peter's having visited Rome, but the very contrary. Paul says expressly,

as a reason for desiring to visit Rome, that he wished not to build on another man's labors, or trench on another man's sphere; (Rom. xv. 20, 21; 2 Cor. x. 15, 16.) Such language would have been impossible, if Peter had visited and labored at Rome before this time. In A. D. 61, Paul was taken to Rome as a prisoner; but the book of Acts says not a word of Peter being there, a thing utterly impossible, if he had been there. Between A. D. 61 and A. D. 63 or 64, the various epistles of Paul from Rome, were written: Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, and 2 Timothy. In delivering salutations from various persons, he never alludes to Peter. This is proof positive that he could not have been there during that time. 2 Timothy, written about A. D. 64, just before, or during the Neronian persecution, states expressly, that Luke alone, of the apostolic laborers, was at Rome; (2 Tim. iv. 11.) This brings us to within a few months of the date of the death of Peter, and yet not a trace is found of his being at Rome.

"Where was he at this time? The only intimation we have of the place of his labors is, the salutation in his first Epistle, (chap. v. 13) "*the Church that is at Babylon, elected together with you saluteth you;*" literally, "*the co-elect in Babylon, saluteth you.*" It is plain from this salutation that, at the writing of this epistle, Peter was at Babylon, wherever that was. Now, as this epistle was written near the Neronian persecution (allusion to which is made in chap. i. 7, iii. 13-16, iv. 12. &c.), we have the place of Peter about A. D. 64, very shortly before his death. Where, then, was Babylon? But two opinions are worth examining: one, that it was, as it naturally would occur to every reader, the place thus known all through the previous ages of the world and books of the Bible; the other, that it was Rome, so called symbolically, as it is in the Revelation. It is marvellous that Popery should adopt this symbolical interpretation, when she thus countersigns her own condemnation in the interpretation of the Revelation. It is like buying a sword at the price of the arm that is to wield it. But in the utter absence of all proof of her claims, Rome, with judicial blindness, will grasp at those that carry with them her own death-warrant. But we cannot yield this point to her, even though it allows her to write her own name in the terrible woes of the Apocalypse. The reasons are: (1.) That Rome was not called Babylon until after

the writing of the Revelation, not having yet earned that title by her bad preëminence in guilt. To have so called her then, would have been unintelligible. (2.) Such a designation was useless for any conceivable purpose of concealment as is alleged, for no one was compromised by it in any way that required concealment. (3.) It would be most unnatural in such a connection. Had the Apostle been denouncing woes on the place whence he was writing, there would have been a propriety in the use of such a symbolical name. But when he was simply dating his epistle; when all the other names, Pontus, Cappadocia, &c., are geographical; when his object was to let all the Church know where this place was, and not to conceal it; when he was writing the simplest didactic prose, and not prophecy, poetry, invective, or the language of passion at all, the use of so symbolical and so unusual a term as this, before its use was introduced by John in the Revelation, is inconceivable to us, if not incredible. The main reason, with most interpreters, for adopting this symbolical view is, the improbability that Peter should be at Babylon. It is commonly assumed, that Babylon was, at this date, a deserted ruin, just as it is now. But this is a mistake. The old city may have been greatly deserted, but not wholly so; and the surrounding region, called also by the name Babylon, retained still a considerable population, and precisely the population that would attract the attention of the Apostle of the circumcision, Josephus tells us, (*Antiq. lib. xv. chap. iii. § 1.*) that "not a few myriads of this people" (the Jews) dwelt "about Babylonia" in this time. The same fact is attested in *Antiq. lib. xv. ch. ii. § 2*; *xviii. ch. ix. § 1*; and *Philo. Op. ii. 578, 587.* Many of the Jews had never returned from the exile, but remained there: a most interesting portion of the race, and one that would naturally attract the attention of a Jew. It was, also, a great centre of ecclesiastical influence; so that, whilst Jerusalem gave the name to one of the Talmuds, Babylon gave its name to the other. Hence, after laboring at the seats of Jewish influence in Jerusalem and throughout Palestine, nothing would be more natural than that Peter should turn his steps towards those of his nation that were dwelling in the fertile satrapy of Babylonia, and, perhaps, in the yet inhabited portions of the ancient city. This fact would account for the silence of the book of Acts concerning his labors from A. D. 50 to A. D.

64; a fact difficult of explanation, if those labors were expended in Palestine or Europe. Peter laboring at Babylon, James at Jerusalem, and Paul at Rome, would seem to be the most natural apportionment that could be made of the field before them. It is no valid objection to this view, that Peter speaks of Paul's writings in his second Epistle (iii. 15), and mentions a Marcus in his first (v. 13), who has been supposed to be the evangelist Mark. Some of Paul's writings had been before the Churches for twelve years, and could have been seen in many other places than Rome, and and there is no other proof that "Marcus my son" was the evangelist, than the wholly uncertain one of an identity of name. Hence we conclude, that the literal and natural interpretation of the word Babylon is the true one, and that Peter, at the time of writing this epistle, A. D. 64 or 65, was at Babylon. But this brings us within a few months of the alleged date of his death, which occurred, probably, soon after the writing of his second epistle; (see Pet. i. 14.) This epistle must have been written soon after the first, as is intimated, ch. i. 13-15; iii. 1. Hence, we have but a few months, at farthest, for this alleged visit to Rome; a visit which, considering the immense distance between Babylon and Rome, is hardly credible.

"We might pause here; but that we may search this thing to the bottom, we will follow the advocates of Popery into the testimony of the fathers on this point, and determine its meaning:

"The first authority that is adduced is Clement of Rome, in his epistle to the Corinthians. We will quote the passage. He has been urging them to constancy by the example of the Old Testament worthies, and now adduces those of the New: 'Let us set before our eyes the holy Apostles: Peter, by unjust envy, underwent not one or two, but many sufferings; until at last, being martyred, he went to the place of glory that was due to him,' § 5. (Apostolic Fathers, Ed. Wake, p. 148.) This is absolutely all that he says of Peter. There is not one word of where he suffered, or when he suffered, or that he ever set his foot in Rome. And yet this is brought forward as a proof!

"The next witness is Ignatius. In his epistle to the Romans, § 4, he says: "I do not as Peter and Paul command you. They were Apostles; I, a condemned man; they were free, but I am even to

this day a servant.' (*id. ut sup.* p. 213.) And yet this is brought to prove that Peter was at Rome! Surely the cause must need support that can bring such testimony to prove a fact; the simple statement of a good man that he was not invested with apostolic authority to write to a Church, to prove that Peter was once at Rome!

"The only distinct testimony that we reach is a letter of Dionysius of Corinth, A. D. 176, more than one hundred years after Peter's death, and only a fragment of it preserved in Eusebius, A. D. 325. Granting that this letter is authentic (a fact that is questioned), what does even it testify? We quote the passage. Alluding to Peter and Paul, he says: 'For both taught alike in our Corinth, having planted us, and both alike also in Italy, in the same place; having taught alike, they suffered martyrdom at (or about) the same time.' Now, if Dionysius is to be understood as asserting that Paul and Peter labored together in person, planting the Church of Corinth, and then travelled and suffered together in person at Rome, he states in the first instance what he must have known to be untrue; for Paul alone planted the Church of Corinth. (see 1 Cor. iv. 15; iii. 6-10; ix. 1, 2;) and, therefore, is wholly unreliable as to the second, which indeed is also untrue, as to Peter's accompanying Paul to Rome; a fact we know from Acts xxviii. not to have occurred. The only other point of his testimony left is, that Peter died at Rome, which is greatly shaken by the fact we know all the others to have been untrue. If, however, we suppose Dionysius only to have meant that the influence of Peter's teaching went with Paul to Corinth and Italy, they teaching the same things, and that they died about the same time, it will be true; but it will no more prove that Peter was at Rome, than that he founded the Church of Corinth. In either case it is of no avail. If the witness is true, he testifies what is of no avail; if false, his testimony can no more establish this point, that is doubtful, than the others which we know to be certainly false. Hence, although we have come to the beginning of the third century, we have not yet found one reliable witness to the fact that Peter was at Rome at all. When we enter the third century, we find the opinion beginning to prevail that Peter died at Rome, though nothing yet about his episcopacy. Irenæus, A. D. 218, (*Adv. Her. Lib.* III. § 1,) asserts the martyrdom of Peter at

Rome, but Irenæus asserts a great many other things, as every reader of him will see, that show him to be a credulous and unreliable man. But after this date we find the belief very general, so that we freely concede it.

“ The fact, however, that we press is, that there is not a particle of evidence for a hundred years after the death of Peter, that it was ever dreamed that he had been in Rome ; that it is not until A. D. 176 that a doubtful testimony occurs ; and that is not until the first quarter of the third century, that we find clear evidence that this fact was believed, and then only in connexion with many admitted falsehoods.

“ We therefore submit that the allegation that Peter ever was at Rome is wholly unproved as yet, as a simple fact of history, and therefore unfit to stand as the basis of such a theory as that which rests upon it. And this further fact is evident, that, in any event, the Church that claims to be infallible must rest on the testimony of fallible men, and that testimony of the most fallible character.

“ The main difficulty in the way of this conclusion is, the existence of this tradition in the Church. How did it arise, if it had no foundation in fact ? It seems to have arisen, partly, from the symbolical interpretation of the name Babylon, in the first epistle, and partly from a mistake of Justin Martyr, who asserted that a statue of Simon Magus was worshipped in Rome as a god, under the name of *Semo Sancus*. This was soon coupled with the story of Simon in Acts viii., and a story invented that Peter had encountered him at Rome, which then assumed the form that he was in Rome in the second year of Claudius, A. D. 42. This is plainly contradicted by the book of Acts, and the whole basis of the story destroyed by the discovery, in A. D. 1574, of the very statue to which Justin refers in making excavations in the bed of the Tiber. It was then found that it was a statue, not to Simon the magician, as it was supposed by Justin, but to *Semo Sancus*, a Roman-Sabian deity.

“ When, therefore, it is remembered, that for a hundred years after Peter's death, we find not a syllable of this tradition ; that then the symbolical interpretation began to creep in with the increasing attention paid to the study of the Apocalypse ; and that we do not find the tradition fully developed until the time of Irenæus, early in the third century, we can see how naturally the

tradition arose, and how little it can be relied upon as a historical fact. There is absolutely no clear, satisfactory proof, that Peter ever was at Rome; the probability clearly is, that he died at Babylon.

“ But suppose these huge chasms filled up, and the fact made certain that Peter did visit Rome, and did die there, where is the proof that he was bishop of Rome? This fact was not at first coupled with the tradition of his visit to Rome. It did not appear until some time afterwards. At first it was asserted that Linus was ordained the first bishop of Rome, by Paul and Peter. This is the statement of Irenæus (*Adv. Heres. Lib. III. § 3*), and also of Eusebius in one place (*Ecc. Hist. Lib. III. § 2, 4*). Tertullian assigns the first episcopate to Clement (*De Script. Hær. c. 32*), in contradiction of the others. The first statement of Peter being the bishop of Rome, is made in a book acknowledged to be spurious, and written as a sort of pious fiction, the *Recognitions of Clement*. This assertion did not obtain credence for some years; indeed, not until about the middle of the third century, when we find traces of it in the writings of Cyprian, A. D. 258, and a claim set up for the first time by a bishop of Rome, (Stephen, the 22d bishop of the series,) to be a successor of Peter. This claim was not generally recognized by the Latin Churches for a century after it was made, so that it was not until the fifth century that it was generally admitted that Peter was the first bishop of Rome. Against the probability of its truth are the facts, that it was utterly unknown to the early Church, utterly unknown to the Scriptures, inconsistent with the relations of Paul to the Church at Rome, and at variance with the nature of the apostolic office, and the division of territory agreed upon with Paul, in which Rome would fall to the charge of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Hence we reject this fiction as a mere invention of a later age, wholly untenable and incredible.”

But if it were demonstrated that Peter was clothed with spiritual supremacy over the whole Church; that he was constituted, by Christ, his sole Vicar on earth; that he was at Rome, and Pope of Rome, it does not

follow that this power and prerogatives were transferable, much less that they were actually transferred. It would remain to be demonstrated that Linus, and Gregory, and all the bishops or Popes of Rome, good and bad, have been clothed, successively, with the same power and prerogatives; that Pius IX. is supreme head of the Church, and sole Vicar of Jesus Christ, because, if it were proved, Peter was, eighteen hundred years ago. Where is the evidence of this? A doctrine so momentous should—*must* have the clearest and most ample proof to command our faith and obedience. It should, and doubtless would, have been written by the finger of God, on imperishable tablets. But this is not the case. There is not a particle of clear proof to support this dogma, but the contrary.

“What were the *prerogatives* of the twelve Apostles, EXCLUSIVELY possessed by them, as distinguished from all other Gospel ministers whatever?” They were the following:

“Immediate vocation. Gal. i. 1: ‘Paul, an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.)’

“The ordination of an Apostle, in the strict sense of the word, was not only *immediately* by Christ himself, without any imposition of hands, but it was *complete at once*.” The inspired history of Paul, who, I believe, was Christ’s chosen successor to Judas, demonstrates this.

“Apostles were taught the Gospel by IMMEDIATE revelation.” Gal. i. 12: “For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.”

"They were *infallible* teachers of it to others." They were *infallible teachers because inspired*. They taught what God revealed, nothing more, nothing less. Tradition was no rule of authority in divine things with them.

They were prophets.

"Apostles had the power not only of working *miracles*, but also of *communicating miraculous powers* to others. Acts viii. 14-19; xix. 6; 1 Tim. i. 6."*

Can these prerogatives be transferred? Have they been transferred? Was Alexander VI., that monster of iniquity, *inspired, infallible, a prophet*; and was he clothed with the *power of working miracles*, and of *communicating that power to others*? If he was inspired, it was by the devil; and if he had the power of working miracles, it was of the kind of the witch of Endor. If, then, these prerogatives were not possessed by him and handed down to his successors, they are not possessed by Pius IX. The chain is broken; and the claim to the Apostleship, the authority and prerogatives of St. Peter, is a baseless assumption.

In his usual happy, clear style, Dr. Moore shows that, if it were demonstrated that St. Peter was clothed with supreme spiritual power, and that that power could have been transferred to others, there is no evidence, but the contrary, to prove that it was actually transferred to, and possessed by, the bishops and Popes of Rome. Hear him:

"We demand proof of its actual transfer. Where is the document, the fact, or the person that testifies to such a transaction? Here is the most tremendous grant of power ever made on earth,

* Powel's Apostolical Succession, pp. 41, 42.

if made at all, and yet there exists not one line of recorded evidence, not a single document to prove this amazing fact ! Indeed, we have proof of the very contrary. Rome herself did not claim this power for centuries after the grant is alleged to have been made. Du Pin, a Roman Catholic historian, admits this. He is also compelled to admit another fact that is still more embarrassing, that this claim of supremacy was actually condemned by the bishop of Rome, as late as A. D. 588. The Byzantine Emperor Mauritius had bestowed, or at least permitted the title of universal patriarch to be taken by John, patriarch of Constantinople, A. D. 586. Gregory, bishop of Rome, opposed this assumption very bitterly.* Du Pin's language describing this transaction is : 'St. Gregory does not only oppose this title in the patriarch of Constantinople, but maintains also that it cannot agree to any other bishop, and that the bishop of Rome neither ought nor can assume it.'

" In a letter to the Emperor Mauritius, arguing against the permission of the title, Du Pin represents him as saying that Peter was not called universal Apostle, 'that the title of universal bishop is against the rules of the Gospel, and the appointment of the canons, that there cannot be an universal bishop, or the authority of all the others would be destroyed or diminished, &c.' (B. 4. Ep. 32.) Here is an inextricable dilemma. If Gregory was infallible, he condemns all succeeding Popes, who have assumed this supremacy ; if he was mistaken in this matter, then he was fallible, and the chain is broken. In either alternative, Popery perishes, as to its peculiar claims. If Gregory, near the opening of the 7th century, knew nothing of this absolute supremacy, we may safely affirm that it never existed. The claims and title of universal bishop were not assumed by the bishop of Rome until A. D. 606, when the infamous and wicked Phocas gave Boniface III. this title, in reward for services that he rendered to him in his unholy designs. The title thus assumed in name, expressed no reality for nearly two centuries, when Nicholas and John, in the ninth century, began a series of measures which Gregory VII., the great Hildebrand, developed in the eleventh century into that gigantic system of despotism that we now find it. Thus it took a thousand years to establish this

* This I have shown under the head of Infallibility See page 91.

claim of baseless and usurped authority, which now asserts this claim as the grant of Jesus Christ.

"Such, then, is the historical basis of the Church of Rome, a tissue of assumptions, none of which are demonstrably true, some of which are demonstrably false. It rests on the positions, 1. That Peter was primate of the Apostles; 2. That he was the first bishop of Rome; and 3. That this primacy was transferred to all his successors. In regard to the primacy of Peter, we have shown that it could not be granted in the designation of Peter as a foundation, the conferring on him of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or the injunction to feed the sheep, for all these things belong equally to the other Apostles; that there is no trace of this primacy in the words or acts of either Christ or the Apostles, or the primitive Church; in the New Testament epistles, in the theory of Church government taught there, in the claims of Peter himself, or the conduct of John after his death; but on the contrary, that there are facts and statements in all these sources utterly inconsistent with this alleged primacy. Hence, the first basis is gone. The second, that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, is equally baseless; for he was not, and could not be a bishop at all; and above all, could not be the bishop of Rome; for it is not yet proved that he ever was at Rome at all, and if he was, it could only have been at the very close of his life for a short time; and if ever at Rome, that there is not a shadow of proof that he ever was bishop of Rome, but rather the contrary. But if all these impossible points were made out, the third step is still wanting, that he transferred this primacy to the bishop of Rome and his successors. Such an awful power would not be transferable at all, or if so, must be made out by the clearest evidence. Not a particle of such evidence exists; the claim was not set up by the bishop of Rome himself for centuries, and was not admitted by the Churches generally until the ignorance and darkness of the middle ages made any ghostly usurpation an easy task. Hence we come to the most impregnable conclusion, that the Romish Church, instead of being founded on a Rock, is founded on a LIE, and stands forth the most gigantic pile of fraud and imposture that the world ever saw."

And that the Pope, I may add, instead of being an

Apostle, possessing the authority and clothed with the prerogatives of St. Peter, is verily, truly Antichrist.

In the assumption, then, of spiritual supremacy, another link of evidence is added to the fearfully-overwhelming array, that the Church of Rome is the great Apostasy. The dark picture drawn by the pencil of inspiration eighteen hundred years ago is filled up in all its outlines and mighty proportions, and we see before us the Man of Sin sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

Temporal Supremacy.

That the Pope of Rome claims temporal supremacy has been denied by some of the bishops and priests, and laymen, and their parasites in this country. The denial, sometimes, doubtless, ignorantly made, is at war with the well-established and undeniable facts of history. If it were denied that the Pope *possesses* temporal power over all governments, there would be, so far as we are concerned, no occasion of controversy. He has never been clothed, either directly or indirectly, with such power, by the King of kings and Lord of lords. But the negation is of the claim. Does, then, the Pope *claim* temporal supremacy?

This question, I am aware, has become, to some extent, a political one. It is such *per se*, of necessity. But with it, purely as such, I have nothing to do. I write not as a politician. The able statesmen of "our own, our native land," will carefully examine every question affecting our political rights, and guard and defend the sacred ark of our liberties. I enter not their arena

and meddle not with their rights. But with this question as it effects civil and religious liberty, and the Church of God, and the salvation of souls, I have to do. It is my right and my duty, as a member of the great family of man, a citizen of this happy Union, and a Christian minister, to examine it thoroughly, to vindicate the truth of history, and show the unscriptural assumptions and dangerous doctrines of the Church of Rome, in this and all other things.

Popes have claimed, and Pius IX. now claims, supremacy over temporals.

Popes have exercised, and Pius IX. now tries to exercise, such power.

The Church of Rome has taught, and does now teach, that this claim is of divine origin, and hence valid; and she has and does now, sustain and defend the Papacy in its exercise.

These are facts which lie buried in the history of the past, and live in the history of the present; and some of them form epochs in the annals of nations. To bring them out and lay them before the reader will be amply sufficient to refute the denial of interested parties that the Roman Pontiff claims temporal supremacy.

And first of all, it may be necessary to observe that spiritual supremacy, in the sense of Rome, logically and necessarily carries with it temporal supremacy.

This is taught by Popes and Councils, and scattered up and down on the pages of a thousand Ultramontane and Jesuit writers. To go no farther back—and the nearer home and to our own day, perhaps, the better—Brownson, in his Review for April, 1854, p. 191, says:

“ Now, although we do not say that the Church commissions the State, or imposes the conditions on which it holds its right to govern, yet as it holds under the law of Christ, and on conditions imposed by that law, must have the power to take cognizance of the State, and to judge whether it does or does not conform to the conditions of its trust, and to pronounce sentence accordingly ; which sentence ought to have immediate practical execution in the temporal order, and the temporal power that assists it is not only faithless to its trust, but guilty of direct rebellion against God, the only real sovereign, Fountain of all law, and source of all rights in the temporal order as in the spiritual. She must have the right to take cognizance of the fidelity of subjects, since they are bound to obey the legitimate prince for conscience' sake ; and therefore of the manner in which princes discharge their duties to their subjects, and to judge and to declare whether they have or have not forfeited their trusts, and lost their right to reign or command the obedience of their subjects. *The deposing power, then, is inherent in her as the spiritual authority, as the guardian and judge of the law, under which kings and emperors hold their crowns and have the right to reign ; for in deposing a sovereign, absolving his subjects from their allegiance, and authorizing them to proceed to the choice of a new sovereign, she does but apply the law of Christ to a particular case, and judicially declare what is already true by that law.* She only declares that the forfeiture has occurred, and that subjects are released from their oath of fidelity, who are already released by the law of God.”

“ We have seen that she,” the Church, “ has even *direct temporal authority by divine right* ; but the power we are now asserting, *though a power over temporals, is itself, strictly speaking, a spiritual power, held by a spiritual person, and exerted for a spiritual end.* The temporal order by its own nature, or by the fact that it exists in the present decree of God only for an end not in its own order, *is subjected to the spiritual,* and consequently every question that does or can arise in the temporal order is indirectly a spiritual question, and within the jurisdiction of the Church as the spiritual authority, and therefore of the Pope, *who as supreme chief of the Church, possesses THAT AUTHORITY IN ALL ITS PLENITUDE.* The Pope, then, even by

virtue of his spiritual authority, has the power to judge all temporal questions, if not precisely as temporal yet as spiritual—for all temporal questions are to be decided by their relation to the spiritual—and therefore has the right to pronounce sentence of deposition against any sovereign, when required by the good of the spiritual order.”

This language is clear, and cannot be misunderstood. It reveals fully, but not too strongly, the doctrine of Papists touching this question of supremacy. The spiritual authority necessarily carries with it the right to govern the temporal, as the greater the less. Hence, if the Pope had spiritual jurisdiction in this country—say a clear numerical majority—he would depose President Pierce or his successors, *if “required by the good of the spiritual order.”* Of the good or evil he is the sole judge. The President, the citizens, could have no voice. The higher-lawism of some demagogues has been emphatically and properly stigmatized as eminently dangerous; but here is a higher-law doctrine openly avowed in this country, and sanctioned by a million and more of citizens of this Republic, which would not simply trample upon constitutional rights in liberating a few hundreds of thousands of slaves, leaving *master and slave free*, but would make *slaves, hopeless slaves* of the millions of the free and the brave. I repeat what I have before said, that no man thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Popery is capable of republicanism. If a colony, or a nation were composed of such men as Mr. Brownson, would there be any freedom among them, except to do the bidding of “his Holiness” and the priests?

“If the Church is the spiritual power,” he continues, “with the

right to declare the law of Christ for all men and nations,* can any act of the State, in contravention of her canons, be regarded as a law? The most vulgar common sense answers, that it cannot. Tell us then, even supposing the Church to have only spiritual power, what question can come up between man and man, between sovereign and sovereign, between subject and sovereign, or sovereign and subject, that does not come within the legitimate jurisdiction of the Church, and on which she has not, by divine right, the power to pronounce a judicial sentence? None? Then the power he (the Pope) exercised over sovereigns in the middle ages *was not a usurpation, was not derived from the concession of princes, or the consent of the people, but was and is hers by divine right*; and whoso resists it rebels against the King of kings, and Lord of lords. This is the ground on which we defend the power exercised over sovereigns by Popes and Councils in the middle ages."

In the *Civiltà Cattolica*, from which I have already quoted, of Nov., 1854, we have this doctrine sent out to the Roman Catholic world. The Jesuit, or Cardinal, or Pope, who wrote it, says:

"As the Church commands the spiritual part of man directly, *she therefore commands the whole man, and all that depends on man*: for it is the property of man to live according to the spirit, according to reason. This is the efficient cause of that wonderful power which the Church has always exercised (though under many different forms) in this world; *which she exercises still; and which is so incomprehensible to mere worldly politicians*. She was but a babe in the cradle in Palestine, when she attacked in the Sanhedrim the chiefs of that people whose inextinguishable vitality has for two thousand years been the puzzle of the philosophers. From the darkness of the Catacombs she dictated laws to the subjects of the Emperors, abrogating decrees, whether plebeian, senatorial, or imperial, *when in conflict with Catholic ordinances*. Emerging from

* The Pope has not by divine right, or by any other right, spiritual supremacy, and therefore has no right to declare the law of Christ for all nations; and hence the conclusion, that his temporal power falls to the ground.

the Catacombs to rule over the Roman world, she led the autocrats by the hand in reforming their statute-books and their administration. Did they resist? *The Church unyielding, saw them thrown at her feet either penitent or crushed.* * * * * Did the Christian emperors become insolent? The Church armed against them their very electors. To every rampant heresy the Church knew how to oppose the power either of the peoples or of their princes; and when these supports seemed at last to have been snatched from her by a universal rationalism, behold! there is a sudden turning back of both: of the nations, fearing an unbridled royal power, and proclaiming the *necessity of a supreme spiritual power*; of the princes, beginning to understand, at the light of a bloody communism, that the principles of the Church *are a firmer foundation for their thrones than bayonets*, which must always be intrusted to a part of the people."

"Thus, amid all formal changes, the power of the Church is always immense. If any doubt it, let them listen to her enemies, who, for so many years, have been proclaiming that the Church is dead; that 'she remains only as an empty and impotent shadow.' They would not vaunt thus against a mere nonentity: the fearless do not boast. The truth is, that the only power dreaded by the demagogues and the ungodly is that very Church which they unite in attacking, calling it 'clerical party,' 'Jesuitism,' 'theologism,' or what not. And they are right in that fear. *To-day, as in all time, the Church commands the spiritual part of man; and in ruling over the spirit she rules the body, rules over riches, over sciences, over affections, over interests, over associations—rules, in fine, over monarchs and their ministers.* Petty politicians may conclude that the Church has lost her power, because she does not enlist artillery, cavalry, and infantry; but the truth is, that the artillery, cavalry, and infantry of the Catholics are in the hands of the Church, inasmuch as in her hands are the mind, the reason, and the power of every true Catholic."

Yes indeed, in the hands of the Church, of the Pope, are the mind, the reason, the power of every true Roman Catholic. And they can be nowhere else, as papists, or

they are guilty of moral treason against the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, and of God himself, as Popes, and Councils, and Jesuits teach them. And the moment "they are anywhere else, if Rome is in power, they are thrown at her feet, either *penitent or crushed*." Now with these declarations before his eyes, declarations published under the sanction of every bishop and archbishop in the United States, and under the eye and approbation of Pius IX. and the Cardinals at the city of Rome—can any man doubt that the Pope claims **temporal power?**

The fourth Council of Lateran, under Innocent III., in 1215, in the third canon, now a part of the law of the Roman Catholic Church, for it has never been repealed, thus teaches this doctrine:

"Heretics shall, after their condemnation, be delivered over to the secular powers. The temporal lords are to be admonished, and, if it should be found necessary, *compelled* by censures to take an oath in public, to exterminate heretics from their territories. If the temporal lord, being thus required and admonished by the Church, shall refuse to purge his land from heretical pravity, *he shall be excommunicated* by the metropolitan and his suffragans: on his neglect during twelve months, to give them satisfaction, this shall be notified to the Pope, and upon such information, his Holiness *shall announce the offender's vassals to be absolved by law from their obligation of fealty, and expose his lands to be occupied by Catholics*, who, having exterminated the heretics from it, shall possess them without any contradiction, and preserve them in the purity of the faith."

Gregory VII. was the first who fully and unequivocally proclaimed the supremacy of the Pope over all temporals, and exercised it. It was his aim and the ambition of his pontificate, "to bring," says Du Pin, "all the crowned heads under his subjection, and to

oblige them to hold their kingdoms as fiefs of the holy see, and to govern them at his discretion." He excommunicated Henry IV., declared his throne vacant and his subjects absolved from all oaths of fealty. He thus modestly speaks of his supremacy, and lords it over the greatest monarch of his day:

"It has pleased thee, O Peter, chief of the Apostles, and does please thee, *that the people of Christendom, committed specially to thee, should render obedience to me.* In this confidence, for the dignity and defence of the holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *I depose from imperial and royal administration King Henry, son of Henry, sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church. I absolve all Christian subjects to the empire from that oath whereby they are wont to plight their faith unto true Kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavor to diminish the majesty of the Church.*"

In a letter to Hermann, Bishop of Metz, August 25, 1076,* in which he calls the Gallican doctrine "madness" and "folly," we have the following:

"We, adhering to the statutes of our holy predecessors, do, by apostolic authority, absolve those from their oath who are bound by fealty or oath to persons excommunicated, and prohibit them, by all means possible, to observe their fealty."

Innocent III. in 1210 deposed Otho IV. From his bull of deposition I take the following:

"The King of kings and Lord of lords, Jesus Christ, has so established the royal power and the priesthood in the Church, that the royal power is sacerdotal and the priesthood royal, as Peter in the epistle and Moses in the law testify, placing over all, *one* whom he has ordained as his vicar on earth; so that to Him (Christ), every knee is bowed in heaven and on earth—so also to him (the Pope),

* He was Pope about twelve years, from 1073 to 1085.

all should give obedience, that there might be one fold and one shepherd. Him, therefore, the kings of the earth so venerate, that they cannot suppose themselves *rightly to reign*, unless they study to *serve him* (the Pope) *devotedly*.

“The Roman Pontiff, who does not perform the part of a mere man, but is the vicegerent of the true God, *looses not by any human, but rather by divine authority.*”

Gregory IX. in 1239, deposed Frederick II. and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance; and Innocent IV. in 1245, repeated it, utterly depriving him of crown and kingdom, of command and subject. Listen at the successor of St. Peter and the servant of Him whose kingdom is not of this world:

“We hearing about the foregoing and many other his wicked miscarriages, had before a careful deliberation with our brethren and the holy Council, seeing that we, although unworthy, do hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said unto us in the place of St. Peter, the Apostle, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,’—the said prince (who had rendered himself unworthy of empire and kingdoms, and all honor and dignity, and who for his iniquities is cast away from God) that he should not reign or command, being bound by his sins and cast away, and deprived by the Lord of all honor and dignity, do show, denounce, and accordingly, by sentence, deprive: absolving all who are held bound by oath of allegiance, from such oath forever; by apostolic authority firmly prohibiting that no man henceforth do obey him or regard as emperor or king; and decreeing that whoever hereafter yield advice, or aid, or favor him, as emperor or king, shall immediately lie under the ban of excommunication.”

This is a part of the decretal law of the Church of Rome to-day—infallible law, and an open precedent for Pius IX.

Boniface VIII., in 1302, issued against Phillippe le Bel of France a bull of excommunication and deposition, from which I take the following extract:

"We are taught by the words of the evangelists, that in his power there are *two swords*, the *spiritual* and *temporal*. For when the apostles said : 'Lo, here are two swords;' namely, in the Church, when the apostles spoke, the Lord did not say, 'It is too much,' but 'It is enough.' * * * Both swords, therefore, are in the power of the Church; namely, the *spiritual* and the *material sword*; but one is to be exercised by the Church—the other for the Church; the one by the hands of the priest, the other by the hands of kings and soldiers, but *at the nod and sufferance of the priest*. But it behooves that one sword be subject to the other, and that the *temporal authority be subject to the spiritual power*; for when the apostle says, 'There is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God;' they would not be ordained, unless the one sword were subject to the other.

"For, truth bearing witness, *the spiritual power can appoint the earthly power, and judge it*, if it be not good; for this the prophecy of Jeremiah truly states of the Church and power of the Church : 'Behold I have set thee over nations and kingdoms,' &c., with the words which follow. Therefore, if the *earthly power deviates, it is judged by its superior*; but if the supreme power deviates, it can be judged by God alone, not by man. Witness the apostle's declaration : 'He that is spiritual judgeth all things, but he himself is judged by no man.' "

"Moreover, we declare, affirm, define, and pronounce, that it is altogether a matter of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the *Roman Pontiff*."

If it be "altogether a matter of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff," then every good papist, always and everywhere, is bound by the strongest possible ties, spiritually and temporally, to him. That temporal as well as spiritual allegiance is here meant, cannot be doubted. He may live in a Protestant country, and take the oath of allegiance to its constitution or monarchy, but he is a subject of Rome. And if the Pope

demand his services, or command him not to obey the heretical government, or ruler, he must, he can but obey; or the Jupiter who holds the thunder in his hands, will throw him at his feet, “either *penitent or crushed*.” It is obedience to the assumed Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, or damnation. And the good papist, unhesitatingly, undoubtingly believing it—for so he has been taught by infallible teachers—will give up his liberty, his country, rather than his hope of heaven; rather than hear that anathema, which, if it came from the lips of God—and he believes it does—would make the stoutest heart quail, and the mightiest hero waver. The Roman Catholic, then, say what you will, is bound by stronger fetters than the yoke of Austrian despotism. We do not fully know, and cannot fully understand, the fearful might and tyranny of the power that lords it over him. He *must* believe and worship, obey and labor, “*at the nod and sufferance of the priest*,” or be cast away forever.

A bull of excommunication and deposition was fulminated against Queen Elizabeth, in 1570, by Pius V. The following extract is enough to show that Rome, in her falling away and proud exaltation, never retraces her steps, or yields a position. England, at that time, was a Protestant country, and entirely independent, in every sense, of the See of Rome:

“PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD.

“In perpetual memorial of the matter, He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed his one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to *one alone upon earth*, namely, to Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and to Peter’s successor, *the Bishop of Rome, to be by*

him governed by plenary authority. Him alone hath He made prince over all people and all kingdoms, to pluck up, to destroy, to scatter, to consume, to plant, and to build, that he may preserve his faithful people (knit together in one bond of charity) in the unity of the spirit, and present them spotless and unblamable to their Saviour. In discharge of which function we, who are by God's goodness, called to the government of the aforesaid Church, do spare no pains, laboring with all earnestness, that the unity and the Catholic religion (which the Author thereof hath, for the trial of his children's faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be tossed with so great afflictions) might be preserved sincere. But the number of the ungodly hath gotten such power, that there is now no place in the whole world which they have not essayed to corrupt with their most wicked doctrines; and, among others, Elizabeth, the pretended Queen of England, the servant of wickedness, lendeth thereto her helping hand.

"Being, therefore, supported by His authority, whose pleasure it was to place us (though unable for so great a burden) in this *supreme throne of justice*, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, pronounce the said Elizabeth to be a heretic, and the favorer of heretics, and by her adherence in the matters aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of *excommunication*, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever, and also the nobility, subjects, and people of said kingdom, and all others who have in any sort sworn allegiance unto her, to be forever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, dominion, allegiance, and obedience. And we also do, by authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom, and all other things before named. And we do command and charge all and every, the noblemen, subjects, and people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her orders, mandates, or laws; and those who shall do the contrary we do include in the same anathema."

Who can longer doubt, if he doubted before, that the Popes have claimed and exercised temporal author-

ity over all people, kings and subjects? And who can doubt, who knows anything of Romanism, that if a majority of the nobility and people of England had been papists, Elizabeth would have been hurled from her throne and crushed, and a Roman Catholic—true and faithful—placed upon it, to rule over England and destroy Protestantism, and blot out the last hope of the world? Thanks to Elizabeth with her firm sceptre, and to our forefathers with their bold, heroic hearts, who bid defiance to the thunders of the Vatican, and have bequeathed us the glorious inheritance of a pure Christianity and civil and religious liberty!

Paschal II., in 1099, excommunicated and deposed Henry IV.; Gregory IX., in 1239, excommunicated Frederick II., and absolved his subjects from their oath of fealty; and Paul III., in 1536 and 1538, deposed Henry VIII. of England, and absolved his subjects from all oaths of allegiance, after he and they had severed all connection whatever with the See of Rome. Paul had no more right in or authority over the kingdom of England, than Pius IX. has in and over these United States.

Pius IX., on the 22d of January, 1854, delivered an allocution against the laws of the kingdom of Sardinia, declaring them to be "null and void." It was the claim and exercise of temporal power. Before I lay a part of this document before the reader, it may be well "to offer a word of explanation of the causes that gave rise to it."

"The government of Piedmont has recently determined, at the earnest request of many of its subjects, and in view of the imperative demands of civilization,

as well as of the best interests of the Roman Catholic Church itself, to introduce a better system than has hitherto prevailed in the distribution of the revenues of its clergy. There are, in the country, over six hundred houses of the different monastic orders, with nearly nine thousand monks and nuns, whose annual revenue is said to be about \$400,000. The government proposes to suppress the convents, except those employed as schools and hospitals; allowing pensions to such of the monks and nuns as shall return to civil society. The other Church property of the country amounts to about eighty millions, yielding a revenue of, perhaps, four millions a year. It is very unequally distributed; the higher dignitaries receiving so large a share, that the government has had to allow between one and two hundred thousand dollars a year, from the public treasury, for the support of the humbler clergy. It is now proposed to distribute these Church revenues, on some equitable plan, among the clergy of *all* classes, as the annual returns are believed to be ample, if properly divided, for the wants of all. These measures, which in themselves appear so simple and so just, are bitterly opposed by the bishops and higher clergy generally.”*

The following extract gives the gist of the matter:

“Matters having now come to such a pass,” says the Pope, “it is not enough to deplore the wrongs done to the Church, but it is our duty to use every effort to remedy this evil, according to the duty of our charge, and therefore we again raise our voice, with apostolic freedom, in this solemn assembly, *and we reject and condemn not only all and each of the decrees of that government, hurtful to the rights and*

* Dr. McClintock’s “Temporal Power of the Pope.”

authority of religion, of the Church, and of the holy see, but likewise the law lately proposed. WE DECLARE ALL THESE ACTS TO BE ABSOLUTELY NULL AND VOID. Moreover, we seriously warn all those in whose name, by whose order or exertions these decrees have been published, as well as all who may sanction, approve, or favor in any way whatsoever, the law lately proposed, to consider in their hearts the penalties and censures contained in the apostolic constitution, the canons of holy Councils, and especially in the canons of the holy Council of Trent, against spoliators and profaners of holy things, against the violators of the liberty of the Church and the holy see, and the usurpers of their rights."

The evidence, then, is clear that the Pope has claimed and exercised authority over temporals, over sovereigns and people; that the present Pope claims and exercises this power; that this power is claimed to be of divine right, and cannot, therefore, be disputed or resisted, and that it can "never lapse." None but the ignorant or interested will deny these facts.

That it has been denied by able theologians and learned Universities, and by the whole Gallican party in France and the United States—a very meagre minority, I am sorry to say, of the Church of Rome—that the Pope *possesses* or is *clothed with*, by *divine right*, or any other *right*, temporal supremacy, is well known. All Protestants join them, and deny that he is invested with any such prerogative. But this denial does not reach and affect the question before us. It is one thing to *possess*, to be *clothed*, by the great God, with authority, and another thing to *claim* and *exercise* it. The claim may be utterly groundless, and the exercise a usurpation. This, we contend, is the case with the Roman Pontiffs. This is the logical sequence of the Gallican's position. Whether the Pope really possesses this awful

power, *jure divino*, is a question which, beyond a simple denial now, I leave for the feeble Gallicans—feeble in numbers—and the dominant Jesuits to settle. The question before us, have the Popes claimed and exercised temporal supremacy—claimed and exercised it as of divine right? is proved beyond all doubt. No intelligent, honest man, I repeat, will deny it.

“Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, asserts positively, that the temporal power of which we speak, was never *claimed* by the Church, and he challenges the production of a single decree or definition in which this power was propounded as an article of faith. ‘Such,’ says the learned bishop, ‘does not exist.’”*

Here is a direct issue. Let the intelligent reader, with the papal decrees, just given, before his eyes, with the words of Pius IX., declaring the laws of Sardinia, passed by her supreme legislative authority; “to be absolutely null and void,” still ringing in the ears of that government, decide the question. But his “Grace,” or Mr. Chandler for him, leaves a loophole through which to escape. *Temporal supremacy*, or the *claim* to it, was never decreed an “article of faith.” This we all know; this never was asserted. Infallibility never has been decreed an “article of faith.” It is, nevertheless, a settled dogma of the Church of Rome, and implicitly believed in by every true Romanist. Spiritual supremacy has never been decreed “an article of faith,” notwithstanding it is a fundamental tenet with that Church. “The learned Bishop” might deny, and doubtless would, if it would serve an end, that “a single decree or definition” has ever been passed or bodied forth, to constitute this assumed spiritual authority an article of

* Chandler’s Speech in the House of Representatives.

faith. But no papist denies, though it is not an article of faith, that the Pope claims and exercises spiritual supremacy. What evasions these infallible men will resort to, when a frank avowal might damage their cause! I will pit against his grace, presently, Roman Catholic writers as "learned" and intelligent as he, who will set the bishop and his readers right, if they will honestly examine them.

The late Bishop England says:

"God never gave to St. Peter any *temporal power, any authority to depose kings*, any authority to interfere with political concerns. And any right which his successors might *claim*, for any of those purposes, must be derived from some other source."

This has been quoted to prove that the Pope does not claim temporal authority over monarchs. It proves anything else. The bishop denies that he has authority derived from God over kings, or over any political question whatever. But he does not deny; if sincere, he could not deny, that the Pope *claims* to have, and that he exercises it. He indirectly admits it. He knew, and the world knows, that he claims it. The bishop denies, and we deny, that he has ever been clothed with such power.

The following propositions by Mr. Pitt, the younger, of England, were submitted to the principal Roman Catholic Universities of France and Spain:

"1. Has the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any *civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or preëminence* whatsoever, within the realm of England?"

"2. Can the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, *absolve or dispense* his Majesty's subjects from their *oath of allegiance* upon any pretext whatever?"

These questions do not meet the case. They have reference to the *possession*, and not to the *claim* of power. The Pope certainly has no political power in England, or right to absolve her Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, but he claims such power. Clement VII., Paul III., that "prince of glorious memory," as Pallavicini calls him, and Pius V., did. Their views have never been rejected by their successors or the Church—how could this be, as they were infallible?—and their decrees have never been abrogated. Pius IX. has no "*civil authority*, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever in the realm of " Sardinia, but he claims it. To deny that he does, that he claims supreme temporal authority over all temporals, and that this has been a dogma of the pontiffs ever since the assumption of the claim by Gregory VII., and that it is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, is to ignore the facts of history and stultify one's self. The Gallicans deny, I may repeat once again, that the Pope has ever been clothed with such power; and hence, the Universities addressed, being Gallican, answered in the negative. They denied the authority, but not its claim.

Louis XIV., in 1682, summoned the bishops of France to an assembly, or Synod, at Paris. The object was to interpose limits to papal abuses and usurpations, and define the doctrine of the Gallican Church on this question of temporal supremacy and councils-general. The four following propositions were passed, and received the hearty support of Bossuet, and of bishops, archbishops, and the laity, and the sanction of Louis :

"1. That the Popes have no power from God to interpose, direct-

ly or indirectly, in the temporal concerns of princes or of sovereign States. 2. That the authority of General Councils is superior to that of the Pope. 3. That the usages of the French Church are inviolable. 4. That the Pope is not infallible in points of faith unless his decisions are attended with the consent of the Church.”*

All these propositions were rejected at Rome, and are now held as rejected. The one especially denying that the Pope has any “power to interpose in the temporal concerns of princes” was by Innocent XI. declared to be “*null*” and “*void*.” The following extract taken from “the notes to Bergier’s *Dictionnaire de Théologie*,” which has long been a standard work in Roman Catholic seminaries,† gives us a brief and authentic history of the fate of these propositions:

“On the passage of the ‘Declaration,’ it was presented to Louis XIV., who in fact had instigated it. The King, to incorporate it with the State law, issued a decree declaring that all who desired to obtain degrees in theology should maintain, as the law of the land the opinions enunciated in the four articles. Pope Innocent XI. did not hesitate to manifest his disapprobation: *he annulled and condemned the act of the assembly of 1682*, in his brief of April 11th, in the same year. ‘By these presents, in virtue of the authority given to us by the omnipotent God, *we condemn, rescind, and annul the acts of your assembly in the business of the regale, with all that followed them.*’

“Nor was Alexander VIII. behind Innocent XI. On the fourth of August, 1690, he published the constitution *Inter multiplices*, in which he condemned, made void, and annulled all that had been done in the assembly of the clergy of France, in the year 1682, as well with regard to the extension of the *regale* as also to the *declaration*, and the *four articles* contained in it: ‘All and singular of the acts, as well with regard to the extension of the *jus regalie*, as

* Dr. McClintock’s “Temporal Power.”

† I quote from Dr. McClintock’s work, not having the original work before me.

to the declaration containing the power of the Church, and the four articles contained therein, *we do condemn, destroy, annul, and make void.*'

"Not less important to our understanding of the spirit and doctrine of the holy see, is the fact that the Popes refused for more than ten years to grant bulls to such of the prelates (nominated to bishoprics) as had attended the assembly, and had signed the declaration. It was not till the time of Innocent XII., in 1693, that the difference was accommodated, by means of two letters written to the Pope, one by the nominated bishops, and the other by Louis XIV. In the letter of the prelates mark the following expression: 'We profess and declare that we grieve vehemently, and beyond the power of words to express, over the acts of the said assembly which have so greatly displeased your Holiness and your predecessors; and we declare, moreover, that whatever was decreed by that assembly concerning the ecclesiastical and pontifical authority, we hold to be not decreed, and declare that it is so to be held.'"

"In 1794 Pope Pius VI., in his bull *Auctorem Fidei*, which has been received, without protest, by all the Churches, renewed these declarations of his predecessors Innocent XI. and Alexander VIII. Moreover, he condemned as rash, scandalous, and supremely injurious to the holy see, the act of the Synod of Pistoia (in its decree *de la foi*) adopting the 'Declaration.' The terms of this 'Constitution' are as follows: Wherefore, as the acts of the Gallican assembly were condemned and annulled soon after their appearance, by our predecessor Innocent XI., in his brief of April 11th, 1682, and afterward more pointedly by Alexander VIII., in his constitution *Inter Multiplices*, August 4th, 1690, much more strongly does our pastoral solicitude require of us to reprove and condemn the recent adoption of those acts by the Synod (of Pistoia) as rash, scandalous, especially injurious in the highest degree to this apostolic see, after the decrees published by our predecessors, and by this present constitution we do reprove and condemn them, and decree that they are to be held as reproved and condemned."

Bellarmino thus states the Ultramontane and Gallican theories:

* The Pope holds in his hand the power, and can compel obedience.

"The first is, that the chief pontiff, by divine right, hath the fullest power over the whole world, as well in ecclesiastical as in political affairs.

"The other opinion, placed on the other extreme, teaches that the pontiff, as pontiff, and by divine right hath no temporal power, nor can he in any manner govern secular princes, nor deprive them of their kingdom and authority, although they otherwise deserve to be deprived,—all the heretics of our times teach so."

He states and advocates a third and middle theory:

"That the pontiff, as pontiff, has not directly and immediately any temporal power, but only spiritual power; he hath especially indirectly a certain power, and that *supreme in temporal matters*."*

This is pure Ultramontaniam stated in milder terms. If the Pope "has not directly and immediately temporal power," that is, if he is not the Emperor of Austria, the Queen of Spain, or the President of the United States—and who ever affirmed that he is?—yet, as he is supreme in spiritual matters, he is of necessity "supreme in temporal;" for the spiritual is above the temporal order. If not the Queen of Spain, therefore, or President of the United States, he is their master, *jure divino*, as spiritual prince and ruler of the world.

Bellarmino sustains his position with a clearness and force of argument that Gallicanism has never been able to refute, and which demonstrates beyond all doubt, that temporal supremacy is a dogma of the Church of Rome :†

"This doctrine may be proved in a twofold way, namely, by reason and examples.

"*The first reason:* The civil power is subject to the spiritual

* Translation by Elliott.

† Dr. Elliott's Translation. I give an abstract, but in his words.

power, when each is a part of the same Christian Republic ; for the spiritual prince can govern temporal princes, and dispose of temporal affairs, for the purpose of a spiritual good, because every superior can govern his own inferiors.

“ For the political power, as such, not only as it is Christian, but also as *political*, is subject to the ecclesiastical power. This is demonstrated: ‘ 1. From the ends of each ; for a temporal or civil end is subordinate to a spiritual end.’ ‘ 2. Kings and pontiffs, clergymen and laymen, do not make two republics, but one, that is, one Church.’ ‘ 3. If a temporal administration impedes a spiritual good, in the judgment of all, the temporal prince is *bound to change* that mode of administration, although it may be with the loss of a temporal good.’ ”

“ *The second reason.* The ecclesiastical state ought to be perfect and sufficient in itself, in order to obtain its own end.” “ The power of using and disposing of temporal or civil things is necessary to the spiritual end, because, otherwise, bad princes could, with impunity, cherish heretics, and overturn religion. Therefore, the spiritual power hath this authority.

“ Furthermore, any State, because it ought to be perfect and sufficient of itself, ought to govern another State not subject to it, and force it to change its administration, nay, even to depose its prince, and institute another, when it cannot otherwise defend itself from the injuries of the other.* Therefore, much more can the spiritual kingdom govern the temporal State subject to it, *and force it to change its administration and depose princes*, when it cannot otherwise accomplish its own spiritual good.”

“ *The third reason.* It is not lawful for Christians to tolerate an infidel king or a heretic, if he would endeavor to draw away his subjects to his heresy, or to infidelity ; but to judge whether the king does or does not draw them away to heresy, *belongs to the Pope*, to whom is committed the care of religion ; therefore, it belongs to the Pope *to judge whether the king is to be deposed, or not to be deposed.*”

“ Christians are not required, nay, they ought not, to tolerate an infidel king, at the evident danger of religion ; for when divine

* The rule would certainly work both ways, and the weaker always certainly be destroyed. Was Bellarmine a fillibuster ? •

right and human right are opposed, divine right ought to be preserved at the expense of human right."

"*Fourth reason.* When kings and princes come to the Church that they might become Christians, they are received with express condition, either expressed or understood, that their sceptres should be subject to Christ."

"*Fifth reason.* When it is said to Peter : 'Feed my sheep,' every power is given to him which is necessary to tend the flock. But a threefold power is necessary for the pastor, namely, one respecting the wolves, that he might drive them away in any manner he can; another is, respecting the rams, that if any of them should hurt the flock with their horns, he could shut them in and prevent them, that they should not thereafter lead astray the flock; the third is about the other sheep, that he would furnish to each of them suitable food. Therefore, *this triple power hath the supreme Pontiff*!"

The examples he gives are those I have already laid before the reader. They cannot be denied, nor explained away. And Bellarmine cites them, and very properly too, to prove that the Pope is (*claims to be*) "*supreme in temporal matters.*"

"Suarez, in his treatise *De Primatu* (lib. iii. cap. 21) asks the pregnant question :

"Can the Pontiff, in virtue of his *spiritual* authority, not merely advise and direct Christian princes, but also *coerce them by punishments, even to the extent of stripping them of royal power, if need be?*"

"This question is answered affirmatively."*

Baronius says :

"All those who take from the Church of Rome, from the See of St. Peter, one of the swords, and allow only the *spiritual*, are branded for heretics."†

Mr. Brownson, in his "Review" for January, 1854, thus emphatically opposes Gallicanism, as recently set

* McClintock's "Temporal Power." † Quoted by McClintock.

forth and defended by M. Gosselin, and proclaims Ultramontaniam to be the true doctrine, and that held by the Church of Rome :

“ We do not like M. Gosselin's theory ; we do not believe it, and could not believe it, without violence to our whole understanding of the Catholic system of truth. The author, in principle, is a thorough-going Gallican ; and, if he defends the illustrious Pontiffs who have been so maligned by non-Catholics and courtiers, he does it on principles which seem to us to humiliate them, and to degrade them to the rank of mere secular princes. His theory, at first view, may have a plausible appearance, but it is illusory, like all theories invented to recommend the Church to her enemies, or to escape the odium always attached to truth by the world. In saying this, we are not ignorant that many whom we love and respect embrace that theory in part, and explain and defend by it the temporal power exercised by Popes and Councils over sovereigns in the Middle Ages. They do not, indeed, agree with M. Gosselin in his denial that the Popes held that power by divine right, but they think it suffices to explain and defend it on the ground of human right. They agree with us as to the supremacy of the spiritual order and the temporal jurisdiction of the Popes ; but they think that all the objections of non-Catholics can be adequately and honestly answered without taking such high ground ; and the ground of human right being sufficient, and less offensive, it should in prudence be adopted, and the other doctrine be passed under the *disciplina arcani*.* They, therefore, disapprove of the course we take, and wish we would content ourselves with more moderate views, not because we are uncatholic, but because we are imprudent, and subject Catholics to unnecessary odium.

“ We found a very general disposition, among the Catholic laity, to *separate religion from politics*, to *emancipate politics from the Christian law*, to *vote God out of the State*, and to *set up the people against the Almighty*. Was this, in these revolutionary times, to be passed over in silence, and no effort made to arrest the tide of political atheism ? We saw our Holy Father driven into exile ; we saw large

* The reader should weigh well this sentence. It lifts a veil that gives us a glimpse of Jesuitism.

numbers of nominal Catholics rejoicing at the impious usurpations of Mazzini & Co., sympathizing with the infamous assassins and parrieides, *who, in the name of LIBERTY and DEMOCRACY, were seeking to overthrow the papacy, and destroy the world's last hope (!)*. What was, then, our plain duty? Was it not to assert the supremacy of God, the jurisdiction of the spiritual power, *to expose the fatal error of Gallicanism*, and, as far as we could, exhibit the real position of the papacy in the Catholic system? So we have felt, and so we have done. * * * If we had not found Catholics bringing out an erroneous doctrine on RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, and endeavoring to prove THAT CATHOLICITY APPROVES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, in the sense it is asserted by non-Catholics, we should not have taken up the subject. * * * As the denial of the spiritual authority soon leads to a denial of the temporal, so the *denial of the temporal soon leads to the denial of the spiritual*. When we found democracy, even by nominal Catholics, embraced in that sense in which it denies all law [Roman Catholic], and *asserts the right of the people*, or, rather, of the mob, to do whatever they please, and making it criminal in us to dispute their infallibility, we felt that we must bring out the truth against them, and if scandal resulted we were not its cause. The responsibility rests on those whose obsequiousness to the multitude made our opposition necessary."

Now, can any unprejudiced man read this article without being deeply convinced that Romanism is the implacable, eternal enemy of *democracy, of civil and religious liberty?*

Listen again at this honored son of Rome and exponent of Roman Catholicism in this country :

"In proportion as we wish to serve religion and society, we must raise our voice against Gallicanism, turn to the Holy Father, and, instead of weakening his hands and saddening his heart, by our denial of his *plenary authority*, re-assert his *temporal* as well as spiritual prerogatives. We have no hope but in God, and God helps us only through Peter,* and Peter helps us only through his successors, in whom he still lives and exercises his apostolate."

* Where is the Virgin ?

In the following extract he shows, in complete refutation of some who have so affirmed, that the Pope never deposed kings by their consent, or by the consent of any one:

"All history fails to show an instance in which the Pope, in deposing a temporal sovereign, professes to do it by the authority vested in him by the pious belief of the faithful, generally received maxims, the opinion of the age, the concessions of sovereigns, or the civil constitution and public laws of Catholic States. On the contrary, he always claims to do it by the authority committed to him as the successor of the prince of the Apostles, by the authority of his apostolic ministry, by the authority committed to him of binding and loosing, by the authority of Almighty God, of Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords, whose minister, though unworthy, he asserts that he is—or some such formula, which solemnly and expressly sets forth that his authority is held by divine right, by virtue of his ministry, and exercised solely in his character of vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. To this, we believe, there is not a single exception. Wherever the Popes cite their titles, they never, so far as we can find, cite a human title, but always a divine title. Whence is this? Did the Popes cite a false title? Were they ignorant of their own title?" * * * * *

"There are documents enough in which the Pope not only excommunicates, but solemnly deposes a prince; and in these very documents we find that the title set forth, and the only title set forth, is that derived from his apostolic ministry. Never does the Pope profess to depose, any more than to excommunicate, by virtue of any other than a divine title. Whatever he does in the case, he always professes to do by his supreme jurisdiction as the vicar of Jesus Christ, and successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles. That the Popes wilfully erred, M. Gosselin cannot pretend."

"One of two things, it seems to us, must be admitted, if we have regard to the undeniable facts in the case; namely, either the Popes usurped the authority they exercised over sovereigns in the middle ages, or they possessed it by virtue of their title as vicars

of Jesus Christ on earth. We do not, therefore, regard M. Gosselin's theory as tenable ; and we count his attempted defence of the Pope, on the ground of human right, a failure."

"The Tablet," published in Dublin, boldly and emphatically teaches the temporal supremacy of the Pope. In a criticism of Mr. Chandler's speech, it affirms that his positions are untenable, his conclusions false, and his language disrespectful to "his Holiness." "The *Civiltà Cattolica*," at Rome; was established for the very purpose of maintaining this theory, and does maintain it most effectually ; the *Historische Politische Blätter*, the most eminent papal journal in Germany, is strongly Ultramontane ; the *Univers*, of Paris, is more Ultramontane than Bellarmine ; the *Belgian* papers, I think, without exception, are on that side.*

"Our doctrines," says Brownson, in his "Review" for April, 1854, "is stated and taken by Padra Cercia, in his *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice*, published at Naples in 1851, as *unquestioned* and *unquestionable*, and adduced as an unanswerable reason why the Pope should not be subject to any temporal power, but should have an independent principality, and the *status* of an independent and sovereign prince. Moreover, the Abbé Rohrbacher, a doctor of theology and a most learned French theologian, defends it throughout his 'Universal History of the Catholic Church,' the second edition of which has just been completed, under the eye, and with the express encouragement of Rome."

Finally, Pius IX. has not only claimed and exercised temporal authority over the laws, and therefore over the king and parliament of an independent king-

* Dr. McClintock.

dom, but he has condemned Professor Nuytz' recent work on Canon Law, because it maintained the Gallican theory, and also for the same reason, "Bailly's Theology," which was used for some time in the ecclesiastical seminaries of France. Gallicanism, then, has ever been in bad odor at Rome; it has been repeatedly condemned and rejected, and *there* it is now dead and its memory loathed. Ultramontanism is dominant.

It is clear, then, that the temporal supremacy of the Pope is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not an article of faith, decreed by Pope or Council, I state again; nor is spiritual supremacy and infallibility, which are not denied to be, nay, are proclaimed, and known to be, fundamental doctrines in her creed. The proof, as the preceding facts and arguments show, is as clear and irrefragable that the former is a doctrine of her creed, as that the latter are. Interested persons may deny it, but no intelligent, honest man, will doubt it.

Has this doctrine any foundation in Scripture? Has the Pope been clothed with authority over all people and rulers, by the "King of kings and Lord of lords"? Where is the proof? Where is the imperishable record of the grant of such power? A doctrine so momentous ought, would have been written by Him who has revealed all things necessary for our government and salvation, with the clearness of a sunbeam.

Is it found in the passage, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"? The kingdom of heaven in this place is the Gospel, which Peter was to preach, and which all the disciples received and preached. "The keys of the *kingdom of heaven*"—that

means the keys of the *kingdoms of this world*! "*My kingdom is not of this world*," said the Lord of glory. "Be subject to the powers that be," infallible Paul taught the Church; temporal powers he meant, beyond all question.

Is it found in the passage, "Feed my sheep"? Then, all the Apostles were clothed with temporal authority, and every true minister is,

"Monarch of all he surveys."

Bellarmino's affirmation and exposition are groundless and silly: "A *triple power* hath the supreme pontiff," conferred upon him by this language!!

Is it taught in the reply of the Saviour, when his disciples said: "Behold, here are two swords;" and he said unto them: "It is enough"? Do those two swords symbolize spiritual and temporal supremacy? And did the Lord teach this doctrine in this expression? No, verily. And by the same rule of interpretation by which you torture such a meaning out of it, you may make a thousand passages of Holy Writ prove just what you please. "The *ten camels* on which Rebecca rode when she went to Isaac," an illiterate expounder once taught, "represent the *ten commandments*; the *servants* who went after her, *Gospel ministers*; *Rebecca*, the *penitent, returning sinner*; *Isaac*, the *Son of God*, and *Abraham*, the *Father*, the *Lord Almighty*!! Now, does this mighty fabric, this unlimited power, at the bare mention of which nations have trembled, and at the simple exercise of which monarchs have been hurled from their thrones, and the sceptres of a hundred illustrious predecessors have crumbled in their grasp,

rest upon such a foundation? Where, then, we again demand, is the evidence that it is of divine right; that the Lord of lords, and King of kings, has ever conferred it upon the Popes of Rome? There is not a particle of such proof. It is a baseless assumption, and a most wicked usurpation of power. And in this doctrine the Church of Rome has added the last link of evidence that she is the Man of Sin, "who sitteth in the Temple of God, as God and above God."

In the assumption and exercise of spiritual and temporal power, the prophecy of the two-horned beast is fulfilled.

We have thus examined some of the doctrines, and the practice and assumptions of the Church of Rome, in each and all of which the evidence is clear and irresistible that she has departed from the faith and is the great apostasy predicted by Paul and St. John. She, and she alone, meets and fulfils, in every particular, the prophetic announcement and description of the great falling away. And yet, with the prophecy before our eyes, and every mark of the Man of Sin, of the Beast, of the corrupt Woman drunken with the blood of the saints, upon the forehead and huge form of this fallen Church, she proclaims that she has not and cannot err, that she is the true Church of God, the pure spouse of Jesus Christ, and that out of her pale there is no salvation! What blind presumption! What strange infatuation! That the Church, the Church of God, who rejects His Word as a rule of faith and exalts the doings and sayings of fallible men to be superior to it, makes vain tradition a guide to heaven! That the Church of God, who proclaims that she is infallible amid a

thousand errors and profound corruptions—infallible, and yet cannot divine where this heavenly attribute resides! That the Church of God, who compels her members to confess their sins to men, who, though wicked as themselves, can—she affirms—and do remit them!—thus rejecting the doctrine of the Gospel of the grace of God of justification by faith, the only way of pardon and salvation. That the Church of God, who holds that a certain temporal punishment due to sin, though the sin has been pardoned, remains to be atoned for by suffering or removed by indulgences, the power to grant which Christ left with her! That the Church of God, who holds that a priest, a mere man, good or bad, can, by a hastily-mumbled prayer any time, create the uncreated God out of bread; that that God is whole and entire in each place, though in ten thousand pieces on ten thousand altars, and in heaven, at the same time; that He is broken by the hands of the priests and ground by the teeth of the faithful, and inwardly digested, and yet is none the less to be adored, though thus eaten! That the Church of God, who has exalted the simple anointing with oil into the dignity of a sacrament, which sacrament remits sins and confers grace upon the dying, though the priest had remitted all his sins and indulgences—had removed all the temporal punishment due to them, and though he had been made a partaker of the divine nature, having eaten the flesh and drunk the blood of the Son of God! That the Church of God, who has created a middle state and place of the dead, a place of purgation, of atonement by fire, by which sins, that the merit of Jesus' blood could not blot out, nor the priest remit, nor indulgences, nor transubstantiation, nor

anointing with oil, with the form of the cross seven times, cancel, before entering that place, may be entirely burnt out, or in some way cancelled! That the Church of God, who adores bread and wine with the highest adoration due to the true God, who bows down before the pictures and relics of saints, and venerates them, in violation of the express command of God, which, for conscience' sake, she has cut out of the law; who invokes saints and angels and worships the Virgin Mary, and sings her praises as the Queen of Heaven; who anathematizes the Bible and Bible Societies, and all Protestants and every good thing; who persecutes to death and wears out the saints of the Most High: who has drunk the blood of millions of the servants of Jesus, and now "whets her fangs and plumes her wings for a more sublime flight of ruin;" who is corrupt in doctrines and manners, corrupt in every department and throughout—deeply, foully corrupt! That the Church of God, who assumes universal sovereignty over the souls and bodies of men, who dwarfs and blights and damns the one, and manacles and enslaves the other! That the Church of God, the pure spouse of Christ, who holds these unscriptural, damning doctrines, who is guilty of these cruel, impure practices, and who wickedly lords it over souls purchased with the precious blood of Jesus! No! no! She is the Man of Sin seen and described by Paul; the corrupt harlot seen by John—"Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." She is not the Church of Christ, but Antichrist.

"But we are sometimes asked by the advocates of Popery: If you deny us to be the true Church, where will you find it? And with a mocking sneer of anticipated triumph, they ask: Where was your

•

Church before the time of Luther? This is a question which would suffuse with shame and conscious guilt any cheek but the shameless cheek of Rome. Where was our Church before the Reformation?

“This is a question that Rome, at least, should never ask, without trembling, if she believes that there is a God who sits in heaven. Where? It is like the grinning mockery of Cain, asking where is Abel; a daring mockery too ghastly and hideous even for Cain. Where are the victims of her cruelty, that pined and perished in the darkness and filth of her countless dungeons? Where are the bones of the murdered Waldenses, who were butchered with the sword, and dashed, the mother with her babe, down the rocks, and left to be a prey for the vultures? Where are the Cathari of Flanders, Savoy and Milan, who were hunted as beasts to the death? Where are the slaughtered Alsations, of whom one hundred, in a single day, were burned, because they ate meat on Friday? Where are the poor Lollards of England, who were hung, quartered and burnt, for reading the Bible? Where are the ashes of Wickliffe, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and Savonarola, and the victims that smoked in the market places of England, and on the plains of Bohemia, before the Reformation? When Rome shall have answered such queries as these, and disgorged the blood that she drank for ten centuries of persecution before the Reformation, and brought forth to the light the bones and ashes that lie mouldering in her dungeons, and charnel-houses, and Golgothas, then we shall be better able to answer the question: Where was your Church before the Reformation? Until then, we say, wherever the hatred of Rome was deadliest, wherever the sword of Rome was reddest, wherever the blood-hounds of Rome were fiercest and fastest in scenting and throttling the hapless heretic, and her *auto-da-fés* thickest, and richest with the blood of martyrs, there were probably traces at least of our Church before the Reformation. But, blessed be God, there was never a time when God was without a witness, and Christ without a people on earth. There were always the seven thousand that bowed not the knee to Baal. They were found in the wilds of the mountains, in the solitudes of the forests, in the obscure streets of the cities, in the hovels of poverty, in the chambers of sickness, and even in the cells of convents and the halls of palaces. There was never a time when there were not hearts that loved Christ, and lips that praised Him, and knees that worshipped Him, and hands that

served Him. The lips of John had not ceased to breathe their words of burning love, until those of Polycarp, Ignatius, and Tertullian caught them up, and they had not yet ceased to speak of Him who loved them until Origen and Cyprian, Lactantius and Jerome, prolonged the glorious tidings. Nor were their lips closed until Augustine and Chrysostom took up the high argument, and rang out the glorious accents with a voice that ceased not to echo through a thousand years of darkness and degeneracy; when the lips of the Gregories and Bedes, Anselms and Gotteschalks, Bernards and Bradwardines, Arnolds and Wickliffes, Husses, and countless others, proclaimed the same truth, that soon shook the world from the lips of Luther, whose trumpet-tongue awakened the slumbering Church of Christ and brought her forth terrible as an army with banners. Since that period, no tongue dares ask, no tongue needs ask: Where is your Church since the Reformation? Many, alas! many, have been butchered by the crusading legions of Rome; have died in her dungeons, or perished at her stakes, or fled from her fury to the land of strangers, and the islands of the sea; and the same dark rendering that is reckoned up against Rome before the Reformation, has been registered since. And now where is your Church of the Reformation? We answer, wherever there are liberty, and law, wherever there are thrift, industry, and prosperity; wherever there are schools and colleges, and printing presses; wherever there are smiling fields and happy homes, and virtuous people; wherever there is all that is strongest, purest, mightiest of modern civilization, and modern thought, there you will find the Church of the Reformation. Wherever Christ is worshipped, and not Mary; wherever beggary and vice are uncanonized and unconsecrated; wherever the Bible is opened freely to the gaze of the world; wherever a pure ritual and a pure ministry are the adjuncts of the cause of religion; and wherever the rights of thought and speech, person, property, and reputation are revered, there you find the Church of the Reformation. And, on the other hand, wherever you find the superstition, the beggary, the rags, and the degradation of Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Ireland, Mexico, Central and Southern America, the fairest regions of the earth as they came from the hand of God, and the foulest as they lie in the hands of man, there you will find the Church of Rome, the undying, unchanging, unforgiving foe to an open Bible and a free Saviour, the gigantic anti-Christ of the world.'

CHAPTER VI.

END OF THE GREAT APOSTASY; OR, DESTRUCTION OF THE MAN OF SIN.

WE have seen, as was predicted, the rise, and progress, and wide-spread baleful influence of the Great Apostasy. The Man of Sin has been revealed, and sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Prophecy now takes up to the mount of vision, and points us to his coming doom; his complete overthrow and utter destruction; and spreads out before us the glorious dawn, and bright, heavenly day of the Millennium.

The end of the Apostasy is as clearly revealed as its rise, and power, and antagonism to God. The instrumentalities employed in the mighty contest of truth with error; the means by which the Lamb, in his war with "that Wicked," will overcome and destroy him, and all the varied forms of evil, are most distinctly stated: the Scriptures of truth, the preachings of the Gospel, and civil government.

The Scriptures.

"And then shall that Wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and the brightness of his coming."—2 Thess. ii. 8.

The spirit of his mouth is his Word, and the brightness of his coming, the light which is inherent in and accompanies that Word and the work salvation wrought by it. "The entrance of thy words giveth light," saith

the inspired bard. "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." "The Word of God," Paul affirms, "is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." "The sword of the Spirit is the Word of God." "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the Man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The Bible, then, is a means, in the hands of Him who inspired it, in enlightening the mind and in consuming the Man of Sin.

It is scarcely necessary in this connection, especially since it has been demonstrated that the Bible is the source and rule of faith, to offer an argument to sustain this position; to prove that the Bible is the only Book which can make man wise in the science of salvation; that it can and does do this wherever it is received and obeyed; and that, consequently, oral instruction, as is vainly contended by Rome, was never designed, by the Author of life, to supplant it, or even to be a means of saving souls, only in so far as it is accompanied with, drawn from, reflects, and is sustained by it. Oral instruction receives its authority and effectiveness from the Bible as the revealed will of God, which has priority of existence and is independent of it. The former, therefore, must be accompanied with and sustained by the latter, and not the latter by the former. The Bible, then, in itself, as God's Word—how can it be otherwise?—is a savor of life unto life; and hence was designed for and should

be given to every man. And wherever it goes, has free course, with or without oral instruction, it will make man wise unto salvation. Give it, therefore, universal circulation, and the Man of Sin will be consumed, and heathen glory and Mohammedan pride bow before it.

Ecclesiastical history, aside from all other evidence, sustains these views, with proof that admits of no doubt or cavil. The Apostolic Church gave the Bible to the people; and pure doctrines and a holy practice mark that era. The Church of Rome, in her fall, and pride, and high pretensions, denied it them, and gave them, instead, oral instruction and miserable traditions; and a thousand years of superstitious error and moral darkness and death proclaim the results. And even now, the millions of her devotees, who are yet denied it, and have oral instruction, believe in and are destroyed by the same superstitious errors. No light breaks through the gloom which shrouds them, no life-giving word thrills and divinely stirs them to repentance and to a saving faith in Christ. The Church of the Reformation enfranchised it—brought up the Bible, as of old, from its long burial, and scattered it as it were upon the wings of the wind, and, where the thunder of the Vatican, the voice of the dragon, did not scathe and crush, it consumed that Wicked, and made man wise unto salvation. And all that we now hold dear, a pure Christianity, the peace of the present and the hope of the future, and civil and religious liberty, we owe, under God, to an open Bible—a Bible published in our own tongue and freely circulated, and in security read. Give it to the world, and the days of Popery will have

been numbered; the end of the Apostasy will have come.

Great, then, beyond computation, is the responsibility which rests upon the Church—the Protestants of this country and of Europe—to preserve the Bible intact, and multiply it as the sands of the sea, and send it out among all people. This responsibility, I am happy to know, is sensibly felt, and is being met in the rapid multiplication and distribution of this light of the benighted and hope of a perishing world.

The British and Foreign Bible Society, which was organized in 1804, has issued and distributed in Europe, and Asia, and Africa and the islands of the sea, in a word, wherever an effectual door has been opened, among all people, over thirty millions of copies of the Word of God. The American Bible Society, instituted in 1816, has issued and distributed, wherever it could send a copy, over eleven millions. Other Bible Societies, and publishing branches, organized since the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the most of them since the American, numbering in all *sixty-eight*, have issued and given to benighted men, nearly six millions. In fifty-two years, then, *seventy* Bible Societies and publishing branches have been instituted, and near *fifty millions* of copies of the Word of God, in nearly *one hundred and fifty languages*, have been published and sent forth to consume that Wicked, and all false religions, and bring in everlasting righteousness. The day of redemption draweth nigh.

When the British and Foreign and American Bible Societies were organized, doubt and gloom hung upon their future. A few friends with but little means, but

with praying hearts and earnest faith and determined wills, laid their foundations; God sent them help, and behold the results!

“ When he first the work begun,
Small and feeble was his day ;
Now the Word doth swiftly run,
Now it wins its widening way.”

The means and facilities for multiplying the Scriptures, and the success which has crowned earnest effort, have transcended, perhaps, the hopes of the most sanguine. The future is redolent of hope. In the next half century, under a gracious Providence, taking the success of the past as a basis of calculation, *three hundred and fifty millions of Bibles and Testaments*, at least, will be sent out to pour the light of life upon the inquiring millions of the four quarters of the globe. Europe, I trust and hope, will be flooded with them. Then, will not the Man of Sin be consumed with the spirit of His mouth, and by the brightness of His coming? Portugal and Spain, Tuscany and Naples, Belgium and Austria, some of them, in natural scenery and climate, gems on the bosom of Italy, gardens in the lap of Europe, may reject for a long time the message of God and turn away the light of their salvation, but He who is Lord of lords and King of kings, will break them in pieces like a potter's vessel, and breathe the spirit of His mouth upon their vine-clad hills and sunny vales, and their enfranchised, redeemed, happy millions, now worshippers of the beast and of his image, shall come to Zion with songs of everlasting joy upon their heads. O, Lord of Hosts, hasten that day! O Thou, who didst inspire of old the Scriptures, send them hence,

till Romanist and Greek, Mohammedan and Heathen, shall bask in the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ!

Preaching.

Another instrumentality in the destruction of the Man of Sin, is the preaching of the Gospel. This is most impressively brought to our view in the fourteenth chapter, sixth and seventh verses, of the Apocalypse, under the symbol of an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth.

“And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.”

The prophet had just seen (ch. xiii.) two ferocious beasts rise up, the one in political society, the other in the Church, but one in religion and one in mind, who had made war with the saints and overcome them. The beast with two horns, or Popery, had changed the pure Gospel into lying wonders, the cross into an idolatrous crucifix, the fear of God he had turned to himself; His worship perverted to a worship of the beast and his image, and His glory he had obscured by ages of moral darkness which hung as the pall of death upon the myriad hosts who followed and worshipped him. The prophet's attention is now suddenly arrested by the flight of an angel in the midst of heaven, who has the pure Gospel to preach to these benighted, deceived

beast-worshippers. He cries with a loud voice: "*Fear God*"! "*Worship Him*"! "*Give Him glory*"! Nothing can be more impressive than this scene. The angel, the time of his appearance, his flight, his message, the evils against which it is directed, and the effects which follow—the fall of Babylon, announced by another angel which immediately follows him.

This angel especially symbolizes, beyond all doubt, the Protestant ministry. The time of his advent—after the rise of the beast, or Popery, and his war with the saints and triumph over the Gospel; his message, "*Fear God*"—this had been transferred to the beast who, in the name of God, lorded it over the people—"Worship Him;" the beast and his image were worshipped—"Give Him glory;" this had been usurped by the foul monster who sat in the Temple of God as God; the flying of the angel, representing haste, energy, zeal; and the success of his mission, the fall of Babylon—all demonstrate that this angel typified the preachers of the Reformation and of this day. And who can think of the zealous, intrepid Luther; the earnest, faithful Zwingli; the indefatigable Calvin; the gentle, determined Cranmer, and the bold Knox, and the message which they heroically, in the very face of the beast, delivered, "*Fear God*"—"Worship Him"—"Give Him glory," and the haste, and zeal, and fire with which they delivered it, without having before the mind this scene? And who contemplate the effects which followed the faithful, zealous preaching of those holy men, if not the fall of Babylon, the shaking of this great city—Romanism—to its very foundations, without being convinced that they were the messengers seen by

John under the emblem of this flying angel? But this angel is still flying in the midst of heaven; keeps on his way, amid storms or sunshine, for his work is not yet done. His clear voice is now heard: "Fear God—Worship Him—Give Him glory." Ear after ear will catch the sound, and heart after heart feel its power. Nations will listen and be converted to God. And the hour of the judgment of Babylon the Great will at length come, and, as a mighty millstone cast into the sea, God will dash her down to rise no more forever. "And there followed another angel, saying, *Babylon is fallen, is fallen*!"

"Where is now her former glory?
Where is now her pride and show?
One brief day relates the story
Of her final overthrow:
Raise your wailings, kings and nobles,
Priests and people, rich and poor—
Babylon is fallen! is fallen! is fallen!
Babylon is fallen to rise no more!"

Civil Government.

Civil government is another instrumentality, in the hands of Him who rules the destinies of nations, by which the Man of Sin will be destroyed. This is most distinctly stated in the seventeenth chapter and sixteenth verse of the Apocalypse:

"And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the Whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire."

This corrupt woman, the Church of Rome, it will be remembered, is represented in this chapter as sitting upon the beast with seven heads and ten horns. These

very horns, or kings, therefore, for a time, give all their strength and influence to maintain her usurped authority and wicked, tyrannical power. Hence, it is said, they make war with the Lamb. This contest is now being waged. Mighty hosts are marshalled by these kings for the onset, and the battle-cry rings amid the hills and over the plains of Italy, and Germany, and even in this country. Long has been the struggle, but the issue is not doubtful. "*The Lamb shall overcome them; for he is the Lord of lords and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.*" The means of this conquest, as we have just seen, are the Scriptures freely circulated, and the Gospel faithfully preached. A free and enlightened press, and the system of colportage, are auxiliary of these, and materially, greatly aid in the contest. The Holy Ghost pours light upon the written page, and attends the preached Word with power and demonstration, giving success to both. The truth will finally prevail; and these kings will be overcome, converted to God, and then they "shall hate the Whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire."

The signs of the times clearly indicate that this change is not very remote. Hungary, Bohemia, Lombardy, &c., are ready to throw off the yoke of the beast and stand up regenerated and disenthralled. Spain, even, shows some signs of returning life. Sardinia is leading the van of the kingdoms in Italy, who begin to feel the tyranny of Rome and to see her moral deformities, and are preparing to reject her assumed claims of unlimited authority. The recent bull of Pius IX.,

declaring her laws null and void, has excited an inquiry as to the right of the Pope to supreme temporal power; and the King and Parliament are convinced that he has no right, divine or human, over the temporal order in Sardinia. His Majesty rejects his claims and defies his thunders. Nor is this all; he proposes to other sovereigns to embrace his views, and to unite with him in the negation of this assumed claim.* This will be a conquest opening a breach into the main citadel, and, according to Brownson, will shake the spiritual authority to its very foundations. Moreover, Protestants, in this realm, are now allowed, under some restrictions, the exercise of their religion, and to build Churches, to preach the Gospel, and to circulate the Scriptures. Through them, with His divine favor, the Lamb will overcome this kingdom, and thence push his conquering way over Italy.

Revolutions, doubtless, will be overruled by the King of kings, to accomplish the purposes of his will in overcoming the ten horns, and in destroying the Man of Sin. That revolutions will stir to their deep foundations many of the kingdoms of Europe and utterly overturn some of them, the most casual observer may read in the signs of the time. Religion, or opposition to, and hatred of Popery, as a system of intensified, relentless tyranny and corruption, will enter into and be a controlling element in some of them. "If we can only get these French away," said an Italian to the Rev. Dr. Murray, on his recent tour in Europe, "we

* Spain is moving in the same direction. And the government of Mexico, under Comonfort, has thrown off the incubus of priestly domination, and is about to adopt a constitution allowing freedom of conscience.

will show you Americans what we will do. "And what will you do?" said I. He replied in a most energetic undertone, "We will establish an Italian republic, and the first thing we will do will be to *kill off these d—d priests, for they are the enemies of the people and the spies of despotism.*" "The next revolution in Italy," adds this close observer of men and things, "will be a terrible one for the priests. The people have a terrible retribution in store for them, and they know it." * *That* revolution will come; the long pent-up fires will break forth at length, and this corrupt Church, who has withstood the storms of five hundred years, because her time was not yet come, may go down with a fearful crash, amid its convulsive throes and the burning wrath of God and men. But I will not speculate. The doom, however, of the Roman Catholic Church, is written. God has declared that that Wicked shall be consumed, that Babylon the Great shall be cast down to rise no more forever. And the means of this destruction, of this overthrow, he assures us, are the Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel, and civil government. And these means, under God, are in the hands of the true Church, and by her must be employed to accomplish His will. How delicate her position! How great her responsibility!

When the Man of Sin will be destroyed is not clearly revealed. Twelve hundred and sixty prophetic days, or literally, years, inspiration declares, will be the life of the beast, the term of the apostasy. But when those years commenced—when the Church of Rome became the beast—for her falling away was gradual—we can-

* Letters to Taney.

not fully determine. If in 606, when the Emperor Phocas proclaimed the Bishop of Rome universal bishop, or supreme Pontiff, and the kingdom of God thus became a kingdom of this world, and Antichrist, according to the solemnly-expressed opinion of Gregory the Great, an infallible Pope, infallible Rome assures us,—then in 1866 Popery will be overthrown, that Wicked will be destroyed. If, however, Rome did not fully fall away till 787, when the second Council of Nice decreed image worship, and the veneration of relics, and the adoration of saints and angels, and the Virgin Mary, thus making her idolatrous, the very essence of rebellion against God—then this apostasy will curse the world for two centuries more, the end will not be till 2047. Who can tell? God has revealed to us that that Wicked shall be consumed; the *time* He has reserved in the councils of His own will. The day will reveal it.

It remains now to notice that the destruction of the Man of Sin, the overthrow of Babylon, will be sudden and complete. This is revealed and most graphically described in the eighteenth chapter of the Apocalypse:

“1. And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory.

“2. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.

“3. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.

"4. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

"5. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.

"6. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double.

"7. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her; for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow.

"8. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.

"9. And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning.

"10. Standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come.

"11. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more:

"12. The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble,

"13. And cinnamon, and odors, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men.

"14. And the fruits that thy soul lusted after, are departed from thee, and all things which were dainty and goodly, are departed from thee, and thou shalt find them no more at all.

"15. The merchants of these things, which were made rich by her, shall stand afar off for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing,

"16. And saying, Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones, and pearls!

"17. For in one hour so great riches is come to nought. And

every shipmaster, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea, stood afar off,

“18. And cried when they saw the smoke of her burning, saying, What *city* is like unto this great city!

“19. And they cast dust on their heads and cried, weeping and wailing, saying, Alas, alas, that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea, by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate.

“20. Rejoice over her, *thou* heaven, and *ye* holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her.

“21. And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all.

“22. And the voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft *he be*, shall be found any more in thee; and the sound of a millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee;

“23. And the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee: for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived.

“24. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.”

In the second verse the angel proclaims “mightily with a strong voice” that “*Babylon the great is fallen*,” and to impress us with the certainty and fearfulness of the catastrophe, he repeats “*is fallen*”!

Her punishment, as stated in verses 6 and 7, will be double that which she has inflicted upon the saints; *the cup which she filled will be filled to her double*. And also, as “she hath glorified herself,” exalted herself above God and men, opposing the one and trampling upon the rights of the other, “and lived deliciously, *so much torment and sorrow give her*.” Profound, then, must be her punishment, indescribable her woe, un-

utterable her agony. Deep and bitter the cup of vengeance that she must drain to the very dregs.

The suddenness and entireness of her destruction are announced in verse 8: "*Her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire.*" And this, too, when she feels secure and fears no danger: "*For she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow.*" How expressive of the present position and proud self-sufficient spirit of Romanism!

The merchants and merchandise mentioned in verses 11, 12, 13, &c., symbolize the hierarchy of Rome, and the spiritual things of which they have made merchandise. Their power will be annihilated, and their traffic in indulgences, and dead men's bones, and the sins and souls of men, come to an end. "*No man buyeth their merchandise any more.*" Hence they bewail her, and cry: "*Alas, alas! that great city that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls! For in one hour so great the riches is come to nought!*"

The utter extinction, the desolation of this Church, is described in the simple, clear, beautiful, figurative language of the 22d and 23d verses: "*And the voice of the harpers, and mtsicians,*" &c.

"No pen of mere human genius has ever sketched such a picture of the loneliness, the solitude, and the death-like silence of a desolate city. No comment upon them, no effort of genius or fancy to heighten or improve their effect, could do anything but offend their chaste and striking simplicity, and impair the awe and solemnity with which they inspire us."*

* "Apocalypse Unveiled."

The opening verses of the nineteenth chapter peal forth the exultant shout of the pure spouse of Christ, at the fall of Babylon, the complete victory gained over the apostate Church, and at the universal *spiritual* reign of Christ her Lord :

"1. And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia ; Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God :

"2. For true and righteous are his judgments : for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand.

"3. And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever.

"4. And the four and twenty elders and the four beasts fell down and worshipped God that sat on the throne, saying, Amen ; Alleluia.

"5. And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great.

"6. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia ; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

This scene is laid in heaven ; but heaven, in this place, and generally throughout this book, symbolizes the Church. The "great voice of much people" certainly, is the voice of the Church on earth, who, with her Son, has triumphed over all her foes. The prophet hurries us away to behold the glory and catch the triumphant song of the mighty militant host, gathered from all people, the "great multitude" of numbers without number, who, "as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings," shout "the grand millennial reign." and ascribe all the glory and praise of their salvation to God and the Lamb. From the mount of vision we see them, and hear the far-off music of voice and harp. With glad hearts we take up their chorus and roll back the swelling strains : "Alleluia ! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."



